VOLUME XXXVI No. 2

The Catholic Historical Review

ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER MARTIN R. P. McGUIRE
JOHN TRACY ELLIS
Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORS

MANOEL S. CARDOZO PAUL KINIERY ROBERT F. McNAMARA
WILLIAM L. DAVIS THOMAS T. McAVOY JOSEPH N. MOODY

Table of Contents

JULY, 1950

ARTICLES

The Return of Pius IX in 1850 . *Friedrich Engel-Janosi* 129

The French Parish and *Survivance* in Nineteenth-Century New England . . . . . *Mason Wade* 163

MISCELLANY

Material in the Archives of the University of Notre Dame Relating to the American Missions in the Far East *Boleslaw Szczesniak* 190

BOOK REVIEWS 212

NOTES AND COMMENTS 235

PERIODICAL LITERATURE 244

BOOKS RECEIVED 251

BOOK REVIEWS

Faith and History: a Comparison of Christian and Modern Views of History. (Reinhold Niebuhr). J. Joseph Ryan 212
Johann Michael Sailer. Der weise guetige Erzieher seines Volkes. (Joseph Maria Nielen). Raphael M. Huber 213
Die Reformation in Deutschland. (Joseph Lortz). George J. Undreiner 215
Major Trends in American Church History. (Francis K. Curran, S.J.). Thomas F. O'Connor 216
Italian American History. Volume II. The Italian Contribution to the Catholic Church in America. (Giovanni Schiavo). Howard R. Marraro 218
Eloquent Indian. The Life of James Bouchard, California Jesuit. (John Bernard McGloin, S.J.). Thomas K. Gorman 219
Legal Philosophy from Plato to Hegel. (Huntington Cairns). Heinrich Rommen 221
The Idea of Usury. From Tribal Brotherhood to Universal Otherhood. (Benjamin N. Nelson). Terence P. McLaughlin 223
Catalan Domination of Athens 1311-1388. (Kenneth M. Setton). Oscar Halecki 224
Erasmus, Tyndale and More. (William E. Campbell). Richard J. Schoeck 225
France 1814-1940. (J. P. T. Bury). Vincent M. McDonald, O.Carm.... 226
The Recollections of Alexis de Tocqueville. (ed. J. P. Mayer). Edward Gargan 228
Italy from Napoleon to Mussolini. (René Albrecht-Carrié). Joseph N. Moody 229
A History of the Old South. (Clement Eaton). Albert R. Newsome ... 230
Plain Folk of the Old South. (Frank Lawrence Owsley). Richard O. Gerow 231
Seizure of Territory: The Stimson Doctrine and Related Principles in Legal Theory and Diplomatic Practice. (Robert Langer). William H. Roberts 232
Coronado on the Turquoise Trail, Knight of Pueblos and Plains. (Herbert E. Bolton). *Coronado, Knight of Pueblos and Plains.* (Herbert E. Bolton). Francis Borgia Steck 233

The Catholic Historical Review

Vol. XXXVI JULY, 1950 No. 2

THE RETURN OF PIUS IX IN 1850

By

Friedrich Engel-Janosi*

Glancing back over a century one may easily say that when the revolution in Rome broke out on November 15, 1848, the Revolution of 1848 was already doomed. Since the June days in Paris, since the Austrian victory at Custoza a month later and the capitulation of rebellious Vienna on the last day of October, the forces of the old political order had been re-established. There had been those who, like the chancellor, Prince Metternich, his ambassador in Rome, and the Austrian envoy to Gaeta in 1849,[1] had seen all of Italy and particularly Rome in the grip of the revolution from the summer of 1846, from the turbulent ovations which greeted the newly elected Pope on the occasion of the amnesty he had granted to those condemned for political reasons: *Non erano aplausi, furono una frenesia.*[2] In September, 1847, even Mazzini had addressed Pius IX as the man most powerful, not in Italy alone, but throughout Europe. Although in Rome the enthusiasm cooled off in the following period, a nation-wide rebirth took place when in Sicily, as in Lombardy and Venetia, the masses rose with the cry: *Viva Pio Nono liberale.* And even as late as August, 1849, Louis Napoleon as prince-president was to refer to Pius IX in his famous letter to

* Mr. Engel-Janosi is professor of modern European history in the Catholic University of America.

[1] St. A., Report, Gaeta, February 11, 1849, Nu. 6a. See "Note on Bibliography and Unpublished Sources," *infra,* p. 162.

[2] Francesco de Sanctis, *Scritti politici* (Napoli, 1900), p. 192.

Edgar Ney as "the prince who, as the first, placed himself boldly at the head of all useful reforms."[3]

Yet, however inevitable the outcome of the Roman revolution was, the Pope was left without resources and without help when his prime minister was murdered on November 15, a prelate of his household killed the next day by the shots fired into the papal residence of the Quirinal, and a cannon pointed at the door of his palace. This time the memory of the amnesty was invoked to prevent the populace from firing at the man who had granted it. "Not a single one of the great personalities of Rome, of whom several were in command of battalions of the civic guard, not one officer, not one minister, not a cardinal dared to come to offer his services to the Pope in those sad circumstances. There was with him during that whole day only the diplomatic corps . . . His authority is absolutely null now."[4] With a radical government being enforced on him and the Swiss guard being replaced by the *civica* of doubtful loyalty, the Pope on the night of November 24 fled to Gaeta in Neapolitan territory, disguised as a priest of the suite of the Bavarian minister.[5]

The sources from which we may form a picture of the political ideas of Pius IX before his election and during the first two years of his pontificate, are few indeed. Even today the memoirs of Count Pasolini, his friend at Imola and then minister in the first 1848 cabinet, are probably the most important. Yet Pasolini believed in the destiny of Sardinia to rule Italy and, since he stood for the declaration of war against Austria, early in 1848 he became estranged from the Pope. We cannot take his memoirs, published after the writer's death by his son, at their face value. Critical evaluation is equally necessary in using the reports of Pellegrino Rossi, the French ambassador at Rome during the years 1846-1848, and later to become

[3] Jules Bastide, *La République Française et l'Italie en 1848* (Bruxelles, 1858), p. 192; Moritz Brosch, *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates* (Gotha, 1882), II, p. 393. The text of the letter to Edgar Ney has been printed several times, e.g., G. Mollat, *La question romaine de Pie VI à Pie XI* (Paris, 1932), pp. 272f.

[4] AMAE, Report, Rome, November 17, 1848. Giuseppe Pasolini, *Memorie. Raccolte da suo figlio.* (Imola, 1881). 2a edizione, p. 142, claims that he and Minghetti were with the Pope during that day, making no reference to the diplomatic corps, but stressing the absence of any dignitary of the papal court.

[5] Raffaele Ballerini, S.J., *Le prime pagine del pontificato di Papa Pio IX* (Roma, 1909), pp. 197ff., publishes: "Da Roma a Gaeta (1848). Relazione della fuga di Pio IX scritta dal p. A. Bresciani e corretta dello stesso Papa."

the prime minister of Pius IX. Rossi, in his reports, gives the impression of having enjoyed an intimate intercourse with the Sovereign Pontiff, the historical exactness of which we may doubt. His dispatches seem to have been influenced partly by his own outspoken political convictions and partly by a desire to impress the government at Paris.[6] Likewise, the usually carefully prepared Austrian reports on the cardinals and the conclaves prove unrevealing in the case of Mastai-Ferretti.[7]

From the memoirs of Pasolini it is known that Cardinal Mastai read such leading publications of the Risorgimento literature as D'Azeglio's *Ultimi Casi di Romagna,* Balbo's *Speranze d'Italia,* the reports of the scientific congress held at Milan and the *Primato morale e civile degli Italiani* by Gioberti. This last work impressed him especially, and it is known that he had repeated discussions on its contents with his friend. We may also accept it as a fact on the basis of those memoirs that the cardinal did not believe that secular matters were being handled in the best way either by the government or by the Church and that he, too, fervently hoped for Italian national independence.[8] Pius himself admitted to the Austrian ambassador that he had been biased against Austria,[9] a statement that may serve as an indication of the trend of the Pope's national Italian feelings and how they fitted well into the main trend of the Risorgimento.

It may be said that in the Italian historical writings of this period the topic of national independence receives far greater attention than that of political liberty. The emphasis put on the mediaeval glories of Italy as compared with the preference given to the histories of modern revolutions in French historiography of the same period is revealing in this respect. Moreover, it has been stressed that the unity to be found in all the tergiversations of the ambiguous mind of

[6] The biography of Pellegrino Rossi by L. Ledermann (Paris, 1929) is not satisfactory. But it still has importance today for its appendix which makes available important documents from French archives.

[7] I have dealt with them in the first part of an article to be published in the *Festschrift* on the occasion of the second centenary of the Oesterreichisches Staatsarchiv.

[8] Pasolini, *op. cit.,* p. 58f.

[9] St. A., Lützow, Lettres particulières, August 21, 1846. The "lettres particulières" of the ambassador written in 1846 are kept under "Rome, Varia, 1847."

the King, referred to as the "Hamlet of Italy," was his insistence on national independence, however adversely disposed he was toward the liberal leaders of the movement, and that—according to this principle—Charles Albert was as unreliable to the Italian parties as to Austria.[10] In a similar way the problem of Italian independence may have been the main concern of the political thought of Pius IX, insofar at least as political problems were ever allowed to become central in his mind. As for his willingness to grant reforms, no doubt can exist. He told the Austrian ambassador, "We will have railways, we will grant amnesties, we will do something. We will also have public audiences." These had been the concessions most demanded by public opinion. It does not seem, however, that in the beginning the conviction of the necessity of granting them, of starting a movement of reform, was linked up with a clearly conceived and detailed program: "Faremo qualche cosa." Certainly the Pope planned to grant but moderate concessions: "The Pope wants to be the sovereign and he will be."[11] As time went on, we may accept the views of Father Ballerini, S.J., who maintains that Pius IX was guided by the reform program which the representatives of the great powers had outlined in the memorandum presented to his predecessor on May 21, 1831,[12] and to which also the text of the allocution of April 29, 1848, refers: "All that we have done in the beginning of our reign is in full agreement with what the rulers of Europe had asked for especially." This reform program of 1831, coming after prolonged diplomatic negotiations, was certainly a moderate one. Yet it contained such principles as improvement of juridical procedure, the establishment of local and provincial autonomy, the restoration of order in finances with the co-operation of local boards, and, finally, the establishment of a Council of State ("Conseil d'Etat"). The Pope was not only very willing to grant such

[10] Cf. Francesco Ercole, "Il Problema di Carlo Alberto," *Pensatori e uomini d'azione* (Milano, 1935). Also Niccolo Rodolico, Carlo Alberto negli anni 1843-49 (Fireze, 1943), pp. 120f.

[11] St. A., Rome, August 21, B, 1846.—Report of a conversation of Corboli-Bussi with the Grandduke of Tuscany held August 30, 1846 in "Pio IX e Carlo Alberto," *Civiltà Cattolica* (1879), 395.

[12] Ballerini, *op. cit.*, p. 118f.; a similar reference to the Memorandum is also made in Pius' letter to Corboli-Bussi, April 27, 1848, *Civiltà Cattolica* (1879), 401. The text of the Memorandum is in H. Bastgen, *Die römische Frage* (Freiburg, 1917), I. 91f.

reforms, but he was so convinced of their necessity that, when he heard of the February revolution in Paris, he is reported to have exclaimed repeatedly: "This is the result of attempting to rule by force instead of by charity."[13] Yet Pius IX, as two statements of his first Secretary of State reveal, did not intend to be the Pope of Gioberti, "un pape à la Gioberti."[14] Hence, the pro-Italian bent in Pius did not go as far as "Neo-Guelfism" proper, it did not envisage a program for the renewal of the struggle of the mediaeval papacy against the empire. No political expansion of the temporal power was intended, although the Sovereign of the Papal States might enter a confederacy with the other Italian princes. The nationalism of Pius IX was similar to that of Charles Albert insofar as both rested primarily on the conviction of the necessity of national independence, and both shared in a nation-wide reaction against "always receiving the law from the foreigner."[15] The Pope, however, did not share the desire for expansion characteristic of the prince who was the last to die as King of Sardinia. "The Holy See has no intention . . . of enlarging its temporal power, only of broadening that of the realm of Christ,"[16] an attitude very natural to Pius IX, who would have repeated the words of his predecessor that he intended to be custodian of souls first and prince second,[17] though in the period under discussion, he would have put more emphasis on the second than Gregory XVI had done.

One more circumstance must be borne in mind. We know from various contemporary observers how much the newly-elected Pope enjoyed in 1846 his popularity and his successes with the population. We are also informed that he was much troubled when such successes

[13] Duc de Broglie, "Mémoires (1825-71)," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, XXVII (1927), 420.

[14] Both statements were made in the summer of 1846; the one in a letter of Solaro della Margarita to Charles Albert, Rome, August 31, 1846, "Visita del Solaro della Margarita a Pio IX nel 1846," *Civiltà Cattolica* (1928), 504; the other in the report of Lützow, Rome, August 21, 1846. St. A.

[15] Nicomede Bianchi, *Storia documentata della diplomazia europea in Italia. Dall'anno 1814 all 'anno 1861.* (Torino, 1861), VI, 427.

[16] ". . . perchè la S.S. non ha intenzione e non l'ebbe mai di dilatare i suoi temporali dominii ma quelli bensi del Regno di Jesu Cristo"; letter of Pius IX to Corboli-Bussi, April 27, 1848, in "Pio IX e Carlo Alberto," *loc. cit.*, p. 401.

[17] Gregory XVI to an Austrian diplomat, cf. the writer's *Jugendzeit des Grafen Prokesch-Osten* (Innsbruck, 1938), p. 150.

were denied to him. His kind heart suffered from a cold response. The leaders of the Roman people soon learned this secret and, therefore, felt sure of being able to use it as a powerful weapon against the Sovereign Pontiff.

Little doubt can exist concerning the fact that conflicting tendencies were making their impressions on the mind of the Pope at the beginning of 1848—the revolution having actually started, contrary to the belief commonly held, in Sicily, not in France, and in January, not in February. But even in those days in which the high-water mark of Pius' popularity was reached, the Sovereign Pontiff had actually said less than he was supposed to have said. When on February 11 he implored the divine blessing for Italy he called it a special favor of Heaven that Rome and the rest of the Italian nation had 200,000,000 Catholic brethren among all nations and tongues. "Thus Italy never could fall into full decay, and this condition will continue as long as the Holy See will continue to be in her center. Therefore, great God, bless Italy and keep for her that most precious of all gifts: her faith." In those words no implication can be found of intent to incite the Italians or the Romans into a war against Austria. In the proclamation of March 30, 1848, to the peoples of Italy in which Pius referred to the events of the previous two months—including victories of the Italians over the Austrians—as being more than merely human work (words of which the Austrian ambassador complained in bitter terms), the Pope spoke of Italy as the land which, if it was not the most beloved by him, yet was nearest to him. Nevertheless, the Romans and the Italians heard and read in those papal pronouncements only what they wanted to find in them, or what was not explicitly denied by them, viz., the exhortation to the war of national independence against Austria. To this war the King of Sardinia eagerly tried to add a religious color and the character of a sacred conflict.[18] "My position is extremely difficult," Pius wrote two days before the allocution of April to his confidant, Monsignor Corboli-Bussi, whom he had dispatched to the headquarters of Charles Albert. Not only the radicals, but also his cabinet, a member of which was his friend Pasolini, yes, even Cardinal Antonelli, later the mouthpiece of conservative policy,[19] head of the cabinet, pressed the Pope to speak out as "the least of evils," the

[18] Letter of Charles-Albert to Pius IX, April 18, 1848, *loc. cit.*, pp. 399f.

[19] The declaration the cabinet sent to the Pope in Pasolini, *loc. cit.*, p. 99f.

word of war, "which I am not permitted to do." Hence the allocution brought disappointment, though for a time an open crisis was averted. Such disappointment was bound to come at some time, for to Pius IX the core of his mission had never been its political or national aspect; he was not thinking of either when, immediately after his election, he referred to his office as the most sublime dignity on earth.[20] In vain the Pope protested that he did not intend to condemn the national spirit as such[21] when he declared his abhorrence to the idea of making war against Austria. In vain did he state that, as the vicar on earth of the Author of peace and charity, he was bound to embrace all nations with equal paternal love. Publicly, too, he repudiated the plans which called for the Roman Pontiff to place himself at the head of a republic constituted of all Italian peoples, and, as he had done privately in his letter to Charles Albert, now publicly he denounced any intention of increasing the temporal power, his sole desire being "that the realm of Christ grow larger every day."[22] Whatever temporary deviations and halts there may have been, a direct line leads from that day of April 29, on which Antonelli correctly foresaw the revolutionary turn, through November 15 to the morning of November 25 when Pius arrived as a fugitive in Gaeta. Already in his manifest of May 1 he had exclaimed: *Populo meus, quid feci tibi?*[23]

Offers of hospitality in case of emergency had sometime before been extended to the Pope. Charles Albert had offered asylum as early as August, 1847. "I admit to you, friend Villamarina, that a war of national independence that would include the defense of the Pope, would be to me the best of all fortunes;" and the invitation

[20] In a letter written to his brothers, A. Monti, *Pio IX nel Risorgimento Italiano* (Bari, 1928), p. 65.

[21] Letter to Charles Albert, May 12, 1848, *loc. cit.*, p. 403.

[22] The text of the allocution in Bastgen, *loc. cit.*, I, 102ff. No attention was given by contemporaries to the sentence in which the Pope expressed his will to contribute to the ending of the struggle, a sentence about which he was serious as his letter to Emperor Ferdinand of May 3, 1848, proved. Yet the letter met with no success. The Staats-Archiv keeps an undated German draft of an imperial answer—polite but negative—which, according to a note made on the document, should have been translated into Latin, but probably was never dispatched.

[23] Bastgen, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

was reiterated in December, 1848.[24] The offers coming from the second French republic were even more pressing: its government sent a special envoy to Gaeta in order to persuade the Pope to continue his travels and to come to Marseille. Both offers had this in common—a generous amount of political egoism, for it was evident what lustre the Sovereign Pontiff's acceptance would bring to the host, were he the king in his desperate struggle to establish a nation-wide hegemony, or the government of a republic just on the eve of its decisive presidential elections. Little doubt could exist as to how important it would have been for the candidacy of the actual head of the government, General Cavaignac, to influence the vote of the numerous French Catholics by extending hospitality to so illustrious a guest, nor would any French designs on the Appennine peninsula suffer from such a fact. Also a factor were considerations such as prompted radical Liberal-Catholics like the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Jules Bastide, to say:

> We thought that received in France with honor, the Pope would be there completely freed from the influence of the cardinals, and would become amenable to that spirit of reform of which he seemed to have given evidence at the beginnings of his reign; he then would understand the necessity of disengaging Christianity from the shackles of Catholic materialism; above all, we thought that with the Pope in France, all of the peninsula would find its full liberty of action.

The reader will understand that that full liberty was not supposed to turn to the detriment of French interests. For the purpose of safeguarding the Sovereign Pontiff a contingent of 3,500 French soldiers had been put at the disposal of an envoy extraordinary on November 17.[25] So little did the French government doubt that Pius planned to proceed to France, that telegraphic orders were dispatched to the prefect of the Department of Bouches du Rhône on December 2 to: "Fire the guns as for a Sovereign at the arrival and debarquement of the Pope," and detailed instructions for the rest of the ceremonial were attached.[26] However, the French ambassador

[24] George Grosjean, "République et Saint-Siège," *Revue des Deux Mondes,* XXIV (1924), 459f; F. de Corcelle, "Souvenirs de 1848," *Correspondant* (December, 1857), p. 585; Bastide, *op. cit.,* p. 198f.

[25] Bastide, *loc. cit.;* Corcelle, *loc. cit.;* AMAE, telegram to D'Harcourt, November 17, 1848.

[26] AMAE.

with whom Pius had discussed the details of his plan to flee from Rome soon had to send word to Paris that, contrary to French hopes, the Pope showed no intention of leaving Gaeta.[27] Pius received the envoy extraordinary of the French government in that town and expressed a wish to visit France as soon as circumstances would permit;[28] but he accepted neither the invitation of France nor that of Sardinia nor that of Spain which had put Majorca at his disposal as early as June 29.[29] He had decided, the French ambassador reported, to return to Rome only with international co-operation. Thus with the appeal for help directed on December 4 to all the Christian powers of Europe, the Roman Question was presented in its international aspect, although Sardinia had attempted to foster the conception of it as exclusively Italian. In positing this international aspect Pius invoked the article of the Congress of Vienna which guaranteed the Papal States, and he did this in the very days in which the man who considered himself the embodiment of hostility against the stipulations of the congress was beginning a political rule destined to last for more than twenty years.

Furthermore, in doing so the Pope brought the Roman Question and that of his restoration into the open where the centuries-old international rivalries had once more arisen around the Italian problem, clashing with one another like conflicting storms. When it entered the international domain, the Roman Question became immediately a serious challenge to the peace of Europe. It was no longer confined to the overt struggle of the two governments in the north of the peninsula, Sardinia and Austria, representing such different principles. But even more threatening to the general peace was the influence it might have on the rivalry between Austria and France. This rivalry had begun in the period when the national independence of Italy had come to an end and had extended through the age of foreign domination on Italian soil in all its phases and now it was to play an ostensible rule in the rebirth of Italian independence. The duel between France and Austria had resulted in a two-fold foreign intervention after the troubles spreading over the peninsula in 1830-1831. To the Italian population at large it mattered very little that

[27] AMAE, Naples, November 30; Affaires Rome 1848.

[28] *Ibid.*, telegram, December 9.

[29] *Ibid.*, Naples, December 10. Still D'Harcourt hoped to persuade the Pope to go to Marseille and on December 26, the newly-elected President once more offered the cordial hospitality of France to the Pope.

one of those interventions took place in the name of the conservative, the other in the name of the liberal principle. It was difficult to overcome the feeling that such principles rather afforded a pretext for the domination of the foreigner. The appearance of one seemed to drag in the other by some kind of fated necessity. Such a danger had existed at the last conclave and, whether conscious of it or not, the cardinals had eliminated it by electing the Pope within an extremely short time. The threats involved in the Austrian-French rivalry for hegemony over Italy were modified in 1848-1849 by the British interests, which at this time largely took the form of jealous watching lest France should establish too strong an influence in Italian affairs. Thus the struggle of Sardinia for the establishment of a strong north Italian kingdom came into the orbit of the special interests of Downing Street.[30] Here, the British statesmen found, was a potential counter-balance to French attempts at increasing her ascendancy. Therefore, Bastide's plan mentioned above, to send 3,500 men to the rescue of the Pope met with the protest of Palmerston.[31]

For a correct evaluation of the European situation at the moment when the Roman Question was presented to the international forum and of the reaction to any attempt made to solve it, it must be borne in mind that an important change in the government of two of the powers concerned had occurred in those very days. Thus one may speak of a political renewal of Austria as having taken shape when Prince Schwarzenberg assumed the government on November 21, a change which achieved its final form with Ferdinand's abdication on December 2, 1848, in favor of his eighteen-year-old nephew, Francis Joseph, for Felix Schwarzenberg was probably the most capable and forceful statesman the new emperor was to have at his side during a reign of almost seventy years. The new prime minister in contradistinction to most of the statesmen of his country—including Metternich—sincerely enjoyed a struggle. In France on December 10, Prince Louis Napoleon had been elected president by an overwhelming majority, largely as the candidate of the peasants. In

[30] The discussion of this problem on a rich documentary basis is the main issue dealt with in the able work of A. J. P. Taylor, *The Italian Problem in European Diplomacy, 1847-1849* (Manchester, 1934), the title of which would better be changed so as to indicate the prevalence of the Sardinian problem.

[31] Vicomte de Guichen, *Les grandes questions européennes et la diplomatie des puissances sous la seconde république française* (Paris, 1925), I, 212.

both countries, however different in many aspects, a return to the "forces of social order" had occurred; a stronger political action could be expected now, especially in Austria.

All the signatory powers of the Congress of Vienna could be called upon to guarantee the provisions agreed on therein. The integrity of the Temporal Power had an additional importance for the Catholic states at a time when the political rule of the Sovereign Pontiff was supposed to be the indispensable basis for the independent and undisturbed exercise of his supreme spiritual office. From this point of view Spain took the initiative in calling for a congress of the Catholic nations to discuss the security and independence of the Pope.[32] In the ensuing weeks various plans were set forth for settling the Roman Question: Austria intended to co-operate with France and, perhaps, with Naples; France, aware of the British attitude, was still favoring a merely Italian solution, i.e., that the papal restoration should be carried out by Sardinian and Neapolitan troops, or by Sardinian troops alone—a plan hardly likely to be accepted by Austria without resort to arms.[33] While no agreement could be reached as to just how the restoration of the Pope was to be accomplished, one thing seemed certain: any isolated intervention of a major power in the Roman Question was likely to bring about a war, the final extent of which no one could foretell.

Meanwhile the papal court had established and organized itself in Gaeta, however primitive the available accommodations proved to be. Among the cardinals who had followed the Sovereign Pontiff into exile, the pro-secretary Antonelli rose to greater and greater pre-eminence. Most of the diplomats who had been accredited in Rome had assembled in Gaeta.[34] The leading part among them was first assumed by the French ambassador, the Duc d'Harcourt, who had replaced Pellegrino Rossi after the February revolution. D'Harcourt never succeeded fully in resolving the paradox of being at once

[32] The text of the Spanish note of December 21, 1848, in Bastgen, *op cit.*, I, 141ff.

[33] Cf. on the plans discussed during January, 1849, Guichen, *op. cit.*, pp. 310ff. As recompensation for a co-operation in that intervention Sardinia offered Naples a part of the Pontificial States, *ibid.*, p. 312; E. Bourgeois - E. Clermont, *Rome et Napoléon III* (Paris, 1907), pp. 10ff.

[34] For a characterization of the diplomats at Gaeta, cf. Prince de Ligne, "Le Pape Pie IX à Gaëte, Souvenirs d'un Diplomat Belge," *Le Correspondant*, CCCXV (1929), 179ff.

the scion of one of the oldest houses of the French nobility and the representative of a democratic republic. While he had given ample evidence of his personal loyalty to the Holy Father, he blamed the Pope for being neither energetic nor progressive enough in granting concessions and reforms.[35] With a voice harsh and curt, he did not know how to win sympathies in Gaeta. Even as early as December, D'Harcourt had clearly formulated the French program of linking the restoration of the Pope with the granting of definite liberal reforms for the Papal States.[36] As was to be the case at the papal court more than once during the nineteenth century, so in Gaeta, the representative of Russia proved influential and *persona grata.* The Spanish ambassador, Martinez de la Rosa, is described as "poet, literary man, a speaker of special distinction, one of the most striking personalities of his nation. From a revolutionary he had become an ardent champion of papal interests."[37] The balance was turning in favor of France when the ambassador to Naples, M. de Rayneval, joined the diplomats at Gaeta and he soon won the confidence of the Pope and Cardinal Antonelli. The representatives of Bavaria, Naples, Belgium, Portugal and some South American countries fitted into the general atmosphere which was one of almost mutual personal trust. Austria was not at first represented. Her ambassador in Rome had several times suffered insults in the spring of 1848; the worst were those inflicted upon him on March 21 when an infuriated mob had invaded the embassy and had torn the imperial arms to pieces. Official relations with the papal government had been suspended after this incident and when anti-Austrian demonstrations increased Count Luetzow left Rome on May 16. Schwarzenberg was hardly satisfied with the way the Austrian diplomat had severed relations with the Holy See; he considered a capable representation of Austria at Gaeta extremely important and entrusted this mission to Count Moritz Esterházy.

A strange and fascinating personality thus entered upon the diplomatic stage. Esterházy had been one of the two friends of L'Aiglon, the son of Napoleon I. Obviously, therefore, the count belonged to that group of Austrian nobles opposed to Chancellor Metternich. Since most members of the Schwarzenberg family were in similar

[35] AMAE, Rome, November 17, 1848.
[36] AMAE, Gaëte, December 23, 1848.
[37] Ligne, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

opposition, this fact may have endeared Count Moritz to the new premier. Yet long before, in the early 1830's, that keen and cultivated—though little known—observer, Franz Dietrichstein, had recognized the outstanding gifts of Esterházy who had just then entered the diplomatic service.[38] Those gifts, however, soon became combined with a morbid eccentricity which, in a way easily understood by a neutral onlooker though hardly to be enjoyed by the superiors of the diplomat, affected at times his willingness or his capacity for turning out written reports. Later Esterházy was to occupy an unusual post in a fateful hour of Austrian history: in the months that led to the war of 1866, Count Moritz, minister without portfolio since 1861, was regularly asked for advice and was listened to by the emperor. He thus became the man of Providence, the very "emperor-minister." His intellectual insight was not matched by a comparable strength of will and, as minister, he was to make the remarkable statement that it was thrilling to stand at the bedside of so interesting a patient as the Austrian monarchy and to watch the turn the illness was taking.[39] One of his colleagues in the cabinet wrote: "In sharp criticism Moritz Esterházy is a master, and he cannot deny himself the pleasure of critically illuminating every opinion, every proposal of another's."[40] Esterházy's conservative and Catholic loyalties always were beyond any doubt.

When after a lengthy and somewhat complicated journey, the Austrian envoy finally arrived in Gaeta on February 4[41] his first reaction was: "I was being awaited like the Messias." And he went on: "It is on us, on Austria, that all hope for safety is placed."[42]

[38] Cf. the writer's *Jugend Prokesch-Osten*, p. 107.

[39] Esterh.'s letter to Mensdorff, Joseph Redlich, *Oesterreichische Staats—und Reichsproblem* (Leipzig, 1926), II, 326f., 773ff. On Esterh.'s activity as minister cf. H. v. Srbik, *Deutsche Einheit* (München, 1942), III, 133ff.; Chester W. Clark, *Franz Joseph and Bismarck* (Cambridge, 1934), pp. 146-149, 499-503.

[40] Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 499f.; quotation from Belcredi, "Fragmente."

[41] Schwarzenberg was heartily discontent with Esterh.'s belated arrival and did not mince words in the dispatch he sent him, January 31, 1849, of which only the draft is kept in Expéditions. Gaëte, 1849. However, as is evident from the dispatch of March 27, Nu. 5, Esterh. succeeded in explaining and justifying his delay. The biographies of Schwarzenberg by Edward Heller (Wien, 1933) and Adolph Schwarzenberg (New York, 1946) do not discuss the Roman policy of the prince.

[42] Lettre particulière, Gaëte, February 16. Rome, Varia, 1849. Gaëta, March 16, Nu. 19A. The archivistic materials referred to from now on are all located in the St. A.

And then Esterházy, in words recalling those of Gregory XVI after the outbreak of the revolution in the Romagna, described how Pius IX, as he said, "has thrown himself into the arms of Austria," and how the Pope had turned back sincerely. Certain of the first meetings at Gaeta were not without embarrassment; Esterházy stated it explicitly for that with Cardinal Altieri, known for his French sympathies. The Pope, however, received the Austrian "literally, with open arms."[43]

Esterházy had full confidence in the cardinal pro-secretary. That Antonelli was among those ministers of Pius IX who less than a a year before had asked for a declaration of war against Austria as the least of the possible evils may have been known to the diplomat. If he did know it it made little difference to him, for Esterházy stressed the frankness and sincerity shown by the cardinal in his conversations, and he was fully determined to back the growing ascendancy of the pro-secretary. "The perfect correctness of his principles is due to the effect that experience has produced on a mind equitable by nature."[44] As for the Sovereign Pontiff, Esterházy was willing to trust the sincerity of the change affected in him also, "however striking and curious such a sudden and complete turning around may appear."[45] But he did not trust the character of the Pope always given, as he wrote, "to the impressions of the moment and open to all influences which reached him."[46] And he was still afraid of a continuing personal sympathy, of a secret preference of Pius IX for the French nation.[47] In the case of Pius, as in that of the Grandduke of Tuscany, endowed with a personality similar to the Pope's, Esterházy considered it of utmost importance to have the right men placed at his side.[48] The prime minister fully agreed with his envoy and at times he was not loath to enjoy the situation thoroughly and to add a touch of cynicism. "There was a time," one of his dispatches begins:

[43] Gaëte, February 11, Nu. 6A. Only the drafts of the reports from Gaëta could be located in the St. A. in 1949; they form part of the Gesandtschafts-Archiv Rom.

[44] Lettre particulière, Gaëte, February 16.

[45] Gaëta, February 11, Nu. 6B, Secret.

[46] Gaëta, March 16, Nu. 19B, Réservé; Naples, December 6, Nu. 59B, Réservé.

[47] Gaëta, March 3, 1849, Nu. 16A; Naples, April 1, 1850, Nu. 32A, Réservé.

[48] Gaëta, March 20, Nu. 20.

when Pius IX declared he would prefer to be jailed in the castle of S. Angelo or to retire into a convent rather than to permit a single foreign soldier, and least of all an Austrian, to tread upon the soil of his fatherland; it seems that the Pope is falling now into the other extreme since he would like to see his states swarm with foreign soldiers and first of all with Austrian ones. As for us, we have passed the sponge *(nous avons passé l'éponge)* over many a page of the history of Pius IX; this however does not prevent Austria from being condemned to do penance for the political errors that Pius committed.[49]

If the representative of rejuvenated Austria received such an enthusiastic reception at Gaeta, the atmosphere grew even more favorable for him due to subsequent events. Four days after Esterházy's arrival the temporal power of the Pope was declared abrogated and the republic proclaimed in Rome.[50] When news of "the last act of that great drama" reached the papal court, Pius IX first attempted to induce Austria to intervene spontaneously, with an army somewhat on the ill-fated pattern of 1831-1832. After Esterházy declined emphatically, the Pope made an outspoken and direct appeal for Austrian armed intervention. Furthermore, a formal note was prepared in Gaeta asking for the armed support of Austria, France, Spain, and Naples and for the moral support of all the other European powers. In this note, on the explicit demand of the Austrian envoy, "the pretexts of nationality and independence" were condemned and homage was paid to the principle of the treaties forming the basis of European public law. Before this note was dispatched Pius invoked explicitly but orally the immediate armed intervention of Austria alone in his favor, telling Esterházy that his intimate wishes and all his hopes were directed exclusively toward this power.[51] The Pope went on to say that only reluctantly would he accept the intervention of an army of republican France, especially since he foresaw the necessity of a foreign occupation under the shelter of which the reorganization of the papal government would take place. In this the Sovereign Pontiff was voicing the firm conviction of Antonelli and the majority of the cardinals that the papal

[49] Lettre particulière, Schwarzenberg to Est., May 31, 1849.

[50] Text in Bastgen, *op. cit.*, I, 113.

[51] Gaëta, February 11, Nu. 6B. Secret. It begins: "Je sors à l'instant même du Cabinet du St. Père, après une audience qui a duré au delà de deux heures . . ."

ST. MARY OF THE SPRINGS
COLLEGE LIBRARY

government was incompatible with those liberal institutions which Pius had granted in the first years of his reign. "The edifice would have to be erected on a new basis."[52] Pius did not conceal from himself that the chances of getting efficient military help from Spain or Naples were slim. In order to give the Austrian government sufficient time for weighing carefully his appeal he decided to postpone the dispatching of the collective note for several days.

The appeal of the Pope affords good evidence for the change which had occurred in the evaluation of the Danubian monarchy, the disintegration of which had been an accepted political dogma in the European chancelleries two months before. But actually conditions in Austria were still far from settled. Neither the problem of revolution in Hungary nor of the declaration of independence in Venice had been resolved. And while Sardinia was even then preparing to denounce the armistice for which she had sued in August, the danger of a French intervention there had not been removed, even setting apart the rivalries and difficulties which continued over German problems in Berlin and Frankfort. The Austrian government under Schwarzenberg was firmly resolved not to let itself be lured into some romantic magnanimity which might finally prove costly to the monarchy. Thus Schwarzenberg, in order to come to the much coveted understanding with France, made the papal offer known in Paris in spite of the secrecy Gaeta had asked for.[53] The news that Austria declined the part the Pope had assigned to her in the question of his restoration, proved a shocking disappointment to Pius as well as to his host, the King of Naples.[54]

From then on all efforts for the restoration of the temporal power had to be based on a French-Austrian co-operation constantly endangered not only by the rivalry between the two partners, but also by the reaction caused by such events as Sardinia's denouncement of the armistice with Austria on March 12 and the crushing defeat Charles Albert suffered at the hands of the Austrian Army eleven days later. This evidence of strength, however, was counterbalanced by the increasing successes of the revolt in Hungary which on April

[52] Gaëta, March 16, Nu. 19B. Réservé.

[53] This communication of Schwarzenberg to Paris was known; f. i. Guichen, *op. cit.*, p. 314. But up to now it has not been known whether there was actually any basis for Schwarzenberg's strange notification.

[54] Gaëta, March 24, Nu. 21; March 26, Nu. 22.

13 came to a momentary climax in the proclamation of the Hungarian republic, the news of which made a deep impression on the Pope.[55] On the other hand, the attempts made in France for the papal restoration had to conform to the program of linking the return of the Sovereign Pontiff to the granting of liberal reforms in the Papal States, as D'Harcourt had conceived it in the previous December. Such a double bill would secure the best results in French internal politics: it would bring the Catholics to the support of the newly elected President and would be in harmony with the plans of the radical assembly to have the French nation and its army act everywhere as the mandatory of universal freedom. It was an outlet that possibly was necessary in order to overcome the difficulties raised by the established doctrine of non-intervention according to article V of the Constitution of 1848: "(The French republic) respects foreign nationalities, as it intends to cause its own to be respected; it does not undertake any war for the purpose of conquest, and it never employs its forces against the liberty of any people." The liberal aspects of the French program did not fit into the ideas held by the most influential advisers of Pius IX in Gaeta, nor were they acceptable to Prince Schwarzenberg who wanted to return to the concept of full sovereignty as held by the Congress of Vienna, in clear opposition to the dictum of the French ambassador in Gaeta that the treaties of 1815 did not exist anymore.[56] Under no circumstances would the Austrian prime minister permit the French, under the pretext of protecting liberal institutions in the Papal States, to establish their hegemony in central Italy. Yet in spite of these tensions, all the powers were agreed on the necessity of the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope, and, as a result of the defeat of Novara, the plans of Sardinia for a purely Italian solution of the Roman Question were moved into the background for the time being. On the other hand, the news of that smashing Austrian victory was instrumental in prompting in Paris a resolution for taking action in a decisive way.

In order to discuss the ways and means of papal restoration, the diplomatic representatives of the powers to which the Pope had appealed for help met in a series of conferences at Gaeta which began

[55] Gaëta, May 12, Nu. 29A.

[56] Lettre particulière, Gaëta, February 16.

on March 30.[57] The first meeting held in ignorance of the battle of Novara was still dominated by the French-sponsored plan for an intervention exclusively Italian (lest Italian national feelings be hurt), to be carried out by the combined efforts of Sardinia and Naples. The result was that the conference contented itself with stating "the impossibility [of the French proposition] without being able to agree on what might be possible." When the French diplomats referred to the abhorrence with which the Romans regarded any foreign intervention, the presiding pro-secretary exclaimed: "Even if the Turk arrived, they would bless him under the present circumstances," and for such sentiment, as the Austrian diplomat pointed out, the urgent petitions coming in every day, gave abundant evidence.[58]

At the second meeting of the conference, D'Harcourt suddenly proposed an exclusively French intervention as the safest and most practical solution, since such an intervention would meet with little resistance from the Roman populations, and in making this proposal the French diplomat did not refrain from allusions to the difficulties Austria still faced within her own boundaries.[59] As a matter of course the Austrian representative objected to the French suggestion and held up the principle of a co-operative effort of the four powers. His attitude won the approval of all the other members of the conference and D'Harcourt withdrew the proposal to which, while still defending its usefulness, he referred as a purely personal one. At that point news was received that a French expeditionary corps of 8,000 men had landed in Civitavecchia on April 24. "The impression that prevails in Gaeta, is one of anxiety." Everyone feared French encroachment upon the internal policy of the Papal States as a consequence of this military coup and at the fifth conference the French

[57] The papal appeal was of February 18. France was represented at those conferences both by her ambassador to the Pope, D'Harcourt, and her ambassador to Naples, de Rayneval; the minutes of these conferences had been available to such authors as Bianchi and A. J. Nürnberger, *Papstthum und Kirchenstaat* (Mainz, 1897f.); these documents were kept highly summary on purpose. The comments to be found in the diplomatic reports prove therefore an indispensable additional source.

[58] Gaëta, April 4, Nu. 24A. "Venisse anche il Turco, i popoli lo benedirebbero."

[59] Gaëta, April 14, Nu. 25.

diplomats immediately made an attempt to capitalize on the landing at Civitavecchia.[60]

The history of the origins of the French expedition does not need to be told here.[61] There is little doubt that when the National Assembly voted funds for an Italian expedition on April 14 the move was connected with the news of Novara. The president in those days was accustomed to point at the bruised national pride of the French and the necessity for accruing some additional glory was evident. "If a Bonaparte has come to power, he must needs accomplish great things and astonish everyone by the splendor of his rule."[62] Influence with the curia in Rome had always proved the point on which the rivalry of Austria and France on Italian matters focused, and this problem was to survive the Italian Question as such after 1870 and 1878. "To do it without admitting it," this advice of Count Molé was adopted by the French government in order to restore the Pope without the chamber being initiated into the plans. It would form the topic of a fascinating study to unravel all the closely interwoven threads which made up the complicated texture of the policy of the Roman expedition. Suffice it to say here, that the initial military results were far from overwhelming and that, especially with the mission of Lesseps, a situation was created at military headquarters before Rome, at Gaeta, in Paris at the Legislative Assembly and at the Champs Elysées full of apparent contradictions and very real tensions. Happily, this was a moment when the French government excelled in the art of speaking in different languages to the chamber, to the Pope, to the revolutionaries in Rome and to the Austrian diplomats in Gaeta or Paris. As a friend of Napoleon III was to ask ten years later: "Whom are we deceiving right now?"—a rhetorical question to which an answer was not expected and probably would have been very hard to give! However, through all the personal intrigues, the trends of political tradition and

[60] Gaëta, April 26; May 4; lettre particulière, April 26. The 5th Conference was held on April 27.

[61] The most detailed study of it is that by L. Bourgeois et L. Clermont, *Rome et Napoléon III* (Paris, 1907) which, however, certainly needs revision. The best available account, though hardly objective, is F. Simpson, *Louis Napoleon and the Recovery of France* (London, 1930), pp. 44ff; cf. also F. C. Palm, *England and Napoleon III* (Durham, 1948), pp. 36ff.

[62] The writer's *Freiherr von Hübner* (Innsbruck, 1933), pp. 81ff.

national interest worked their way, howevermuch dependent on and modified by the concrete inner political situation. At once mindful of the ringing catchwords of the French political tradition, eager to win the support of the nation's Catholics, yet unwilling to give up the enthusiastic vassalage of the Italian carbonari, hesitant, sceptical, but withal confident in his star, profoundly irreligious—if there was anything profound in his strange personality—yet restorer of the temporal power, a man easy to silence, but almost impossible to win over, the prince president, with an obstinacy comparable in its extreme only to his vacillations, led the Roman expedition not to a brilliant success, yet, not into the disaster that had loomed for it both in the fields of foreign and domestic policy. His task was rendered easier when the elections for the Legislative Assembly resulted in a conservative majority, and on May 27 the radical National Assembly gave way to its successor.

The effect of the landing of the French expedition was balanced somewhat by the quelling of the revolution in Sicily by Neapolitan troops and by the restoration of the grandduke in Florence by the Austrians, both events taking place in May. Schwarzenberg, well aware of the still precarious situation in the Danubian Monarchy, by no means wanted to clash with France. Moreover, he too seemed to believe, as Metternich had done, in a supernational community of governments for the sake of preserving the social order against the onslaught of the socialists, and in this connection he assigned no meager importance to the future actions of the prince-president. He thought common interests should prevail over the trends making for an embittered rivalry between the two governments in Italian affairs, and more than once the Austrian prime minister pointed out that Piux IX, in giving protection to nationalistic hopes, was largely responsible for the difficulties of the present situation. This, he wrote to his envoy in Gaeta, would be a badly chosen moment for tilting with the French in the Roman Campagna.[63] Moreover, Schwarzenberg himself was not blind to the necessity of introducing reforms into the government of the Papal States; he, too, recalled the demands put down in the Memorandum of May, 1831, and what had come from them. But the principle on which such changes should be based would be a different one from that advocated by the French:

[63] Instruction to Esterházy, March 27, Nu. 3, Réservé; Lettre particulière, May 31, 1849.

the reforms should spring spontaneously from the plenitude of the sovereign power of the Pope, and no concessions should be imposed on him. "Pius IX may make all the sacrifices within his power so as to establish a good government; he may consent to a secularisation of the larger part of the offices; but he should not permit himself to be deprived of his rights of sovereignty." These words, which in no way reflect an isolated sentiment if viewed in the context of the instructions given by the prime minister, are contained in a private letter to Esterházy.[64] There is no reason for assuming that they were not sincere.

From a similar point of view Prince Schwarzenberg was passionately opposed to a plan of Piux IX, according to which the Pope was willing—while not accepting the much discussed French hospitality—to visit France after the restoration of the temporal power in order to impart his benediction to the nation.[65] Schwarzenberg ordered Esterházy to oppose by all means the idea of the Sovereign Pontiff's travelling.

> When surrounded by the imposing pomps of religion, the head of the Church raises his hands from the Tribuna of St. Peter to impart his benediction *urbi et orbi*, we understand that he appears as the living symbol of the immutable truths, the deposit of which has been entrusted to the Church. On the other hand, a Pope on tour, scouring a part of Europe by railway and blessing at the stations the crowds of the curious gathered there in order to enjoy a new spectacle, would be—it seems to us—only an idle catering to the frivolity and the scepticism of those false minds which abound everywhere.[66]

Nothing came of the plans.

In the allocution of April 20, of which he himself had written the largest part, Pius IX, in surveying the history of his reign, "admitted many a deception, and a withdrawal from many illusions now to be regretted."[67] No indication of a plan for liberal reforms could be found in the allocution which emphasized the help given to the Pope by Austria. Yet the French diplomats continued to insist on a program of such reforms. They would have liked a promise to be given for the proclamation of a constitution, but Cardinal Antonelli flatly

[64] Lettre particulière, May 31.
[65] Gaëta, February 11, Nu. 6B, Secret.
[66] May 8, Nu. 4 "en chiffres"; May 19, Nu. 1, Réservé.
[67] Gaëta, May 15, Nu. 31C. The text of the allocution in Bastgen, *op. cit.*, I, 114-143.

declined to make such a pledge. Pius told the French that he was willing, after the restoration of the temporal power, to revive the State Council [*Consulta di Stato*] and to give it a deliberative vote in financial matters, but having only consultative faculties in all other respects. As for the apparently insoluble problem of laymen holding offices in the Papal States, the Pope was willing to make a declaration that he would make the appointments on the basis of the capacities and the aptitude of the candidates without excluding priests. Finally Pius explained that, without wanting to make a definite statement, it seemed to him at present that a parliamentary regime would be incompatible with the free exercise of his spiritual power.[68] To Esterházy the Pope showed that he was alarmed very much, referring to the third occupation of Rome by the French within fifty years. "The number of nine is fatal to the Holy See; we had ninety-nine, then nine; and now we are in forty-nine."[69] Thus Pius seemed little impressed by the fact that Oudinot and the French expeditionary corps had finally succeeded in reducing the resistance of the Romans by July 3. Yet before this occurred a decisive change had taken place at the Quai d'Orsay when Alexis de Tocqueville, the author of *Democracy in America,* was appointed successor to Drouyn de Lhuys. De Lhuys, who was to return to this office three more times, had been the embodiment of French diplomatic tradition; Tocqueville, whose activity as minister of foreign affairs has not yet been closely studied, certainly brought to his office a sharply defined personality, with a mind probably better suited for intellectual analysis than for action. Some may have watched with interest the continuation of the exchanges between the two protagonists in the field of foreign policy in Paris and Vienna.

From the beginning of his career as minister of foreign affairs, Tocqueville admitted that he considered the Roman expedition as an error in French policy: and since it proved unpopular, though on different grounds with a large part of the nation,[70] he wanted to

[68] Gaëta, May 24, Nu. 33.

[69] Gaëta, August 13, Nu. 37A, Réservé.

[70] Paris, June 12, Nu. 27A. Hübner, Schwarzenberg's special envoy to Paris, reports on a conversation with Tocqueville concerning the Roman question. Hübner sums up his report in the following sentences: "Cette première entrevue avec le nouveau ministre des Affaires Etrangères ne m'a laissé que des bonnes impres-

bring it to an end quickly. But since the French had gone to Rome, certain of their demands had to be granted and, for Tocqueville also the reforms in the temporal power ranked first among them. To obtain such reforms the Austrians were very willing to co-operate, as Schwarzenberg had repeatedly pointed out to his envoys. From a draft made by an Austrian diplomat then on a special mission in Paris, and on which Tocqueville added comments and notes, we may see that the two powers had come close to each other's point of view. In his dispatch of July 3 to Paris, Schwarzenberg, too, recommended that the deliberative vote be granted to the Consulta in financial matters,[71] and the dispute then became centered on this question. In the beginning the Pope and Antonelli had offered it. Later they wanted it eliminated, while the French insisted upon considering the deliberative vote in such questions as the only one in the list of promised reforms which indicated that some beginning of constitutional life was to be re-introduced in the Papal States. The Austrians then suggested a compromise in exempting from the deliberative vote such sums as were necessary for the regular administration. But certainly the Austrians, too, considered the introduction of reforms indispensable for the Papal States. In agreement, with the Memorandum of May, 1831, Schwarzenberg put emphasis on the development of the municipal institutions as especially congenial to the Italian mind. The Austrian prime minister, who realized the difficulties that would have to be overcome in order to introduce

---

sions. Mr. de Tocqueville est pénétré de la nécessité d'en finir le plus tôt possible avec la complication romaine. C'est fort désirable pour le St. Père et pour l'Europe général, mais pour la France, c'est un besoin urgent, c'est presqu'une condition vitale."—Tocqueville took over as minister of Foreign Affairs on June 2. On the history of his appointment, cf. Bourgeois-Clermont, *op. cit.*, 155ff. Tocqueville, in his *Recollections*, ed. by J. P. Mayer (New York, 1949), pp. 269f., reports that in coming to power he adopted two maxims: "The first was to break without reservations with the Revolutionary Party abroad . . . the second was never to touch things which were clearly beyond our strength." Both may have determined his attitude in the Roman affair.

[71] Schwarzenberg to Thom, June 12; to Esterh., July 4, Nu. 2, Réservé, and more detailed to Hübner, July 3; November 10, Nu. 1, to Esterh. on the urgent necessity of carrying out the reforms. On the basis of such evidence it is difficult to understand why Guichen, *op. cit.*, 402, 405, declines to take the reform plans of Schwarzenberg seriously. Annexe au rapport, Nu. 44 F, Paris, August 29.

those reforms, wrote that the Sovereign Pontiff must conquer them nevertheless or run the risk of perishing.[72]

An additional complication developed during the period of D'Harcourt's absence when a new French diplomat, M. de Corcelle, a friend of Tocqueville, entered into the negotiations between Gaeta and France. He was a liberal Catholic, typical of that period, full of good will and optimism, assuming that here and now was the best chance for linking the introduction of the much discussed reforms in the temporal power with some reforms within the Church itself. He championed "that monstrous alliance between the Church and political radicalism," enthusiastically praising the reforms of the early Pius IX which, according to Corcelle, had impressed such an august character on the February revolution of Paris. "Help us to give an amiable physiognomy to the Church," he had said to Esterházy somewhat naively. "In moving in Gaeta, with all too much assurance, M. de Corcelle displayed an ardor and insistence which gave evidence of zeal rather than ability, and certainly not of familiarity with the conditions of the terrain on which he moved."[73] It did not prove difficult for an Antonelli to prevail over such a partner, and the French point of view was in no way furthered by the first activities of Corcelle.

The French Army having entered and occupied Rome, it was important to restore normal life in the capital of the Catholic world. Only on such a basis was there hope that the Pope could return within a short time. It was decided to send a commission composed of three cardinals to Rome for this purpose. The choice proved difficult. Once more complaints were raised about the scarcity of political and administrative talent in the members of the Sacred College. Once more the candidacies of Bernetti and Lambruschini, the two Secretaries of State of Gregory XVI, loomed up in the beginning and were eliminated. The former, against whom the veto of Austria had been directed at the papal election of 1846, was now the target of vehement French antipathy, the second was generally considered the embodiment of reaction. In the end Cardinals della Genga, Vannicelli, and Altieri were selected. Esterházy approved of the first two and violently disapproved of the last. All of them had been created by Gregory XVI. The first two were briefly characterized in the *tableau*

[72] September 10, Nu. 1.

[73] Gaëta, August 13, Nu. 37A, Réservé; August 18, Nu. 40A, B.

des cardinaux which the Austrian ambassador in Rome had composed for Metternich in August, 1842.[74] The first was praised for his exemplary religious life, while the second was mentioned as an example of an elevation simply as the result of having held an appointment "cardinalitien" without having been given an opportunity to distinguish himself in this post. Altieri whose elevation was published in 1845, had been made the object of a special secret report[75] in which his "gallomanie," a disease the Austrians were inclined to believe rampant at the papal court, was stressed. A scion of an ancient Roman family, the nobles of Rome promoted his career. "God protect us from his being elected," the anxious Austrian diplomat had exclaimed, and Esterházy three years later shared the feelings of his predecessor, referring to the blind French partiality of Altieri, and adding that the pro-Secretary of State, like all men of common sense, regretted this nomination. As for Vannicelli, he mentioned the pro-Austrian feelings of this cardinal and stressed that della Genga, who had aroused the antipathy of Pius IX in former days, was not a reactionary. However, he added that this appointment seemed to indicate a more profound political conversion of the Pope than the diplomat had expected. "As to what concerns us," Esterházy wrote, "we could not have wished for anyone better than della Genga."[76] It is known that the commission of the cardinals was received in Rome with distrust and antipathy and little was accomplished by their labors.

At the conference held in Gaeta on August 11, Antonelli presented the ideas according to which the Pope planned to re-establish his temporal government.[77] As the meeting opened, Rayneval once more urged the granting of liberal reforms in conformity with the wishes of the French government. "It was not prudent on the part of the Papal government to withdraw everything from a people to which one had first made all concessions." Was it—one feels tempted to ask today—that after the first passage at arms for national independence

[74] Rome, August 23, 1842, Nu. 36A.—I have studied this report in my article on the Conclave of 1846, *op. cit.*

[75] Lettre particulière, May 31, 1846, Nu. 1, in Varia Rome, 1847. Altieri had been created "in petto" in December 1840.

[76] Gaëta, August 13. Nu. 37A. Réservé.—Stock, *op. cit.*, pp. 54f.

[77] The *comte rendu* of the Conference printed in Bianchi, *op. cit.*, 499 ff.—Report Gaëta, August 15, Nu. 39, Réservé.

had been made without bringing the coveted result, more emphasis was put on the liberal aspect of the Italian question, or was it rather that the diplomats and statesmen became aware of the danger of unbridled reaction setting in if at the last moment something was not rescued from the liberal program? To those questions one must always take into account the keen feeling of the government in Paris that some results should be obtained in order to make the Roman expedition and the papal restoration more popular with the French. Antonelli, however, was not impressed. In later years, in answer to suggestions for introducing liberal reforms into the administration of the Papal States, he was to reply: "Better disappear as we are with all the great ideals and forms of our past greatness." Now, remembering 1848, he grew ever more convinced that such reforms would be considered merely as representing a triumph of the revolutionary party and that still more would be immediately demanded. It was Antonelli of whom the liberal, Lord Acton, wrote that he was "the most intelligent Roman statesman since Consalvi and yet the most inefficient and sterile."[78] In reporting to the conference of August 11, the cardinal pro-secretary, while setting forth the plans of the Pope as Pius had described them to the French diplomats and to Esterházy in May, made no further mention of the granting of the deliberative vote in financial matters to the Council. That concession, Antonelli explained, would bring the Pope whom it would render dependent on the majority of the assembly, back to representative institutions and thereby back to that fatal situation which had forced him into exile the previous year. Antonelli declared that the Sovereign Pontiff did not in conscience consider a representative government compatible with the independence and the liberty of the head of the Catholic Church. In this conviction Pius found himself strengthened when he became aware of the great importance which the cabinet of Turin and the partisans of the Left in Rome attached to this very concession. In having made the deliberative vote a matter of the conscience of the Pope, the diplomats at Gaeta found it hard to voice opposition. To objections of the French envoy the cardinal replied that Pius IX, rather than grant concessions contrary to his conscience, would expose himself to all kinds of inconveniences. This was already the attitude of "better disappear as we are."

The French diplomats counterattacked: they submitted a detailed

[78] Cambridge University Library (England) Add. 5641.

note to Antonelli in the name of France, "foremost among the Catholic Powers."[79] Referring once more to the Memorandum of May, 1831, they returned to their demands for the deliberative vote in matters financial and for making governmental offices accessible to laymen. In the vein of Corcelle, which we noted previously, the note went on to praise the salutary effect of the reform work of Pius IX and stressed the religious character of the February revolution. It was said that it devolved upon France, since she had cleared up the present situation, to lay the foundations for the future, and it was said without excess of modesty. Antonelli's reply, if not in the negative, was non-committal.[80]

To make things still more complicated, Louis Napoleon at this time wrote a private letter to a colonel of the expeditionary corps which, however, was published officially two weeks later.[81] In it he took it upon himself to speak as the representative of French demands for reform, summing them up in not very precise terms as "a liberal government." "The Roman Question is getting more complicated every day," Esterházy lamented, and he complained that his efforts to make the Papal government proclaim its political principles had all come to naught.[82] Giving way to pressure from many sides, Antonelli at last read to the conference the papal Motu Proprio dated September 12.[83] In it Pius IX, restating his views as he had exposed them to the diplomats, granted officially those reforms which had been under discussion for the previous half year: (1) a Council of State [Consiglio di Stato] for consultation on legislative and important administrative matters; (2) an Assembly [Consulta di Stato] for the supervision of finances; (3) Diets in the Provinces. The functions of all three institutions would be

[79] Gaëta, August 29, 1849; printed in Bianchi, *op. cit.*, pp. 508ff. The note was written by Corcelle in spite of severe illness, cf. Tocqueville, in his speech to the French Chamber, October 18, 1849, printed as Annex in de Tocqueville, *Recollections*, ed. by J. P. Mayer (New York, 1949), p. 314.

[80] Bianchi, *op. cit.*, p. 514.

[81] Napoleon's letter to Colonel Edgar Ney is of August 18, 1849, and was published with some modifications in the *Moniteur*, September 7; cf. Mollat, *op. cit.*, p. 272f.

[82] Gaëta, September 3, Nu. 43. Neapel, August 22, Nu. 46. The Pope and his court left Gaëta for Portici on September 4.

[83] The text in Bastgen, *op. cit.*, 158ff.

exclusively consultative and their members appointed by the Pope; in the case of the two last bodies, the appointments were to be made according to recommendations. (4) Emphasis was given to municipal autonomy, but here again the important office-holders were to be appointed. (5) Reforms were promised in the spheres of civil and criminal law and in administration. (6) Announcement was made of a forthcoming amnesty from which, however, certain categories of people would be excluded. Special laws were to settle the details of the first five categories of reforms. The Pope stated finally that the regulations as now expressed were completely compatible with his position as Vicar of Christ.

When the text of the Motu Proprio was read to the conference, the French delegates—probably due to the views of Tocqueville on Roman affairs—declared themselves completely satisfied, as did the Austrian government. The importance of the document would, as a matter of course, largely depend on the laws that were to settle the questions of detail. There was full understanding between the governments of Paris and Vienna regarding the necessity of a complete and broadminded implementation of the institutions announced in the Motu Proprio and a generous interpretation of the amnesty decree.[84] A new difference between the two governments arose, however, with regard to the time of the Pope's return to Rome. The French wanted it done promptly, while the Austrians thought the conditions prevailing in the capital not sufficiently settled. According to the reports of Esterházy, no moderate liberal party existed in Rome, contrary to the beliefs held in Paris and London concerning this point. Adherents had been enlisted only for the extremes, either for the men of the Revolution or for the quaking conservatives who were unable to conceive of any improvement.[85]

The question of the return of the Pope was aggravated by the fact that Spain was recalling her troops from the Papal States, and it was assumed generally that Naples would follow suit. In such a case the protection of a Pope resident in Rome would be handed over

[84] Neapel, September 24, Nu. 47; also October 16, Nu. 50; Schwarzenberg to Esterh., October 11, Nu. 1. On September 22 the members of the Conference which then was held in Portici, were unanimous in stressing the importance of municipal autonomy and the necessity of judiciary and administrative reforms as announced in the Motu Proprio, Neapel, October 5.

[85] October 16, Nu. 50; October 23, Nu. 53.

exclusively to the French, as the Austrian troops had confined themselves to the occupation of the northern section of the Papal States. So hesitant an attitude did not imply any criticism against the behavior of the French garrison in Rome. In fact, Esterházy was most outspoken in bestowing on it all praise; he referred to its excellent spirit, its perfect attitude, and impressive devotion. "If it is pretense," he said, "it is certainly well feigned and does not miss its effect."[86]

Surprisingly enough it would seem that Pius IX, and especially Antonelli, found themselves the targets of violent criticism from the College of Cardinals when the moment for carrying out the provisions of the Motu Proprio arrived, because of their "liberalism." The majority of the cardinals had always objected to any reform by the Pope. The regime of Gregory XVI, so bitterly criticized for its reactionary character at the moment of his death, assumed a new halo now after the experiences of 1848, and Lambruschini, his former secretary, was still influential with the members of the college. Furthermore, it is well known how little sympathy Antonelli found with his colleagues, due to the prominence to which he had risen and to the complete confidence Pius IX had in him. "And yet he will have to prostrate himself at our feet," one of the cardinals exclaimed.[87] In this sense they battled to weaken the *lois organiques* meant to settle the details necessary for carrying out the Motu Proprio.

As for the date of the return of the Pope, Antonelli on this point found himself in agreement with the majority of the cardinals in wanting to postpone it in order not to expose the Pope to French influence, while a minority favorably disposed to France attempted to have it hastened. After the French army of occupation was reduced to less than 10,000 men, a consistory fixed the day of the return for the first half of April,[88] in spite of the fact that it was known that the Roman population still was lacking in enthusiasm for

[86] Schwarzenberg, November 18, 1849; Esterh. Lettre, Rome, May 30, 1850. The content of Esterh.'s letter is in full contrast to what A. J. Nürnberger, *op. cit.*, II, p. 380, reports without mentioning his sources.

[87] Bianchi, *op. cit., p.* 559—The diplomats, regardless whether they favored the policy of Cardinal Antonelli or not, agreed that no member of the College was equal to him in political capacities.

[88] Neapel, March 7, 1850, Nu. 22, Réservé.

Pius IX. Esterházy explained the decision as the result of a customary lack of energy at the papal court, of a disinclination to oppose French wishes, and of the Pope's anxiety to return to his post regardless of risks. French diplomacy made clever use of all these circumstances, and the Austrian diplomat did not forget to mention finally that intimate personal sympathy of Pius which always would make him incline in preference, not so much toward France, as toward the French.[89] Cardinal Antonelli once more had to resign himself. In view of the facts mentioned it would have meant wasting his influence if he had tried to object. Pius IX at this moment was prepared to face even martyrdom.

The Austrian government had been urging that, in order to improve the feeling of the population and to make the return of the Pope to his capital an epoch-making event, the *lois organiques* should be elaborated in the spirit of the Motu Proprio. Thus the general uncertainty would be banished. On the *lois organiques* the prime minister wrote: "their promulgation should usher in a better era."[90] Yet the advice from Vienna for taking the initiative, for governing forcefully instead of wearily administering, had little chance of success—all the less so since Tocqueville had left the Quai d'Orsay on October 31, and no superior will then directed the foreign policy in Paris. From the beginning of Esterházy's mission, Schwarzenberg had his envoy explain to the papal court that the Austrian government was willing to abolish the Josephinistic legislation in the Danubian Monarchy. The preparatory work for the concordat to be concluded in 1855 thus took its inception in early 1849.[91] Such communications, which always made an impression on the Pope, were meant also to help render Pius IX more amenable to Austrian advice. Yet in the question of reorganizing his state, the Pope apparently was reluctant to expose himself again in political matters. Schwarzenberg was to use strong language in order to carry on the work of reform: "You will continue to speak to the Papal government in the same sense as you did before in the matter of internal reform and never make common cause with those who dare to advise the attitude of a lukewarm and irresponsible spectator in the face of the urgent

[89] Neapel, March 7, Nu. 22, Réservé; April 1, Nu. 32A.

[90] Schwarzenberg, January 29, 1850, Nu. 2; February 15, 1850, Nu. 2.

[91] Cf. Esterházy, Gaëta, February 7, 1849, Nu. 2. Réservé.

[92] August 8, 1850, Réservé.

needs of the population and of the imminent dangers that threaten the social order."[92]

On April 4 the Pope left his residence at Portici, and he made his entrance into Rome on April 12. Esterházy reported that a sincere but moderate ovation hailed Pius IX on his journey back to his capital; in no wise did it recall the *frenesie* of 1846. To the Romans, the Austrian diplomat commented, the return of Pius IX was not an event significant enough to dispel the feeling of insecurity as to the future.[93] Also, the rivalries between the Austrian and French foreign services for the prevailing influence in Rome continued, and more than once these susceptibilities and diplomatic quarrels were not devoid of pettiness. Yet, since the French occupation of Rome continued and no end of it was in sight, the unrest in the minds of the population continued as well, and one feels that Pius IX was speaking sincerely when he addressed Esterházy: *In somma, in mano di chi sto io oggi? in mani dei Francesi.*[94] The Austrian representative meanwhile viewed with critical eyes the political decisions and activities of Pius IX, partly because, according to the diplomat, the bonds with a number of personal friends of the reform era still continued to bind the Pope, and partly because Esterházy considered a lack of tenacity an essential mark of the character of Pius. He was equally outspoken, however, on the fact that no wavering or indecision could be found in Pius when a problem of the spiritual realm was entered upon: then the attitude of the Sovereign Pontiff was marked by a "steady firmness."[95]

But the main political task which was left, the formulation of the provisions to put into force the Motu Proprio, did not advance well. The reactionaries from all sides sent in their warnings. Naples especially was afraid of the influence the Roman institutions would exercise on its population and on its own problems, and the petitions of the ultra-conservative elements of the Papal States had the same tenor. We do not yet see clearly how much Antonelli acted in these circumstances out of a feeling of resignation. He seemed to be concerned primarily with foreign policy and endeavored to prevent the elements of unrest throughout the peninsula from interfering. We know that the cardinal grew sceptical in those years as to the future of the

[93] Rome, April 19, Nu. 37.

[94] Rome, May 28, 1850, Nu. 43B, Réservé.

[95] Rome, November 7, 1850, Nu. 72B, Réservé.

temporal power. It would seem, further, that the mind of Pius turned away from concrete governmental measures, though, as is evidenced by his encyclical of December 8, 1849, concerning socialism and communism,[96] he gave attention to general social problems. Only a study of the documents preserved in the Vatican Archives can provide us with the full story of those years, but there is no doubt today that Pius IX, on returning to Rome on April 12, 1850, was no longer the man who had enjoyed taking the initiative in political reforms. The friend of Cardinal Mastai, Count Pasolini, reported that the Pope during a long audience he had in April, 1855, had said to him, "Let us not speak of times that never can come back!"[97] But Pius IX, on his return to Rome, may have continued planning administrative reforms, yet it should be remembered that as early as May 30, 1848, the Pope had appointed a commission which was to study those modern errors, largely social and political, which were to be condemned in the Syllabus of December, 1864,[98] the roots of which thus can be traced back to the spring of the Revolutionary year.

The *lois organiques* to put in force the Motu Proprio of Portici were published between September and November, 1850, but they proved a disappointment because of such provisions as the narrowing of the electoral basis. The Austrian government had hastened to forward its congratulations after the publication of the first section, expressing the hope that the rest would be promulgated soon.[99] Apparently Schwarzenberg was chiefly interested in evidence of governmen-

[96] Nürnberger, *op. cit.*, II, p. 395.

[97] Pasolini, *op. cit.*, p. 189. The American minister, Lewis Cass, Jr., was presented to Pius IX on April 19, 1850. He reported on his conversation with the Pope to the Secretary of State: "With great frankness, he (the Pope) spoke of his late efforts to introduce liberal reform into his States, and of the difficulties which he had encountered, adding that he had learned by painful experience that it required much caution and prudence to prepare his people for an order of things to which they had not been accustomed. Far from being disheartened, however, by the late untoward result of his political experiments, he stated, with a firmness and consistency, which does him no small honor, it to be his intention to pursue the same course in future, and on all practicable occasions to introduce into his government salutary measures of reform, which he admitted to be much needed." Stock, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

[98] Carteggio, *Pasolini-Minghetti* (Torino, 1924), I, 105, footnote 1, on the basis of the process of canonization of Pius IX.

[99] Schwarzenberg, September 29, 1850.

tal activity, in some proof of a determination to take political leadership. The trends in Europe did not favor such an attitude. Did the Austrian prime minister himself succeed either in Lombardy-Venetia or in Austria proper in similar endeavors? Fascinated by the dangers threatening from the spread of socialistic and communistic doctrines, fearful of a repetition of 1793 that seemed to loom before it, Europe was ripening for the coup of December 2, 1851, and was becoming willing to hail "the nephew" as the savior of the social order. In the Papal States the *lois organiques* and the Motu Proprio, though much restrained and hardly sufficient, never took on real life.

The explosion of the revolution of 1848 in Rome had brought about an international reaction more widespread than that caused by the failure of the Danubian Monarchy to defeat the Hungarian revolt single-handed. Like the Russian intervention in Hungary, the restoration of the temporal power was closely linked with and permeated by egotistic interests, by the demands of "reasons of state" on the part of the interfering powers. There was little that was surprising in all this, for the powers in their actions throughout history had never relinquished such principles. Nevertheless, the international character of the Roman Question was established a few weeks after the flight to Gaeta, and the attempts of the court of Turin and of the radicals in Rome to give it an exclusively Italian character were discarded in 1848-1849. Antonelli, in guiding papal policy, therefore, continued to concentrate his efforts on keeping alive the supernational aspect of the papal government, which had come into existence "not in order to rule, but not to be ruled," not so much because it was "desirable" but because it was "inevitable."[100] As a consequence he overlooked the importance of internal political conditions, considering them to be exclusively dependent on the currents sweeping through the international sphere. It would require a detailed study against the background of general diplomatic, and probably of universal western history, to ascertain the share of responsibility of the nations and individuals involved for the fact that the international reaction in the fall of 1870 was so different from that of the winter of 1849.

The Catholic University of America

[100] Lord Acton in *The Rambler*, II. (1859), p. 149.

Note on Bibliography and Unpublished Sources

Pius IX in Gaeta has been discussed in most publications dealing with the life of that Pope, but a standard biography of the Pontiff is lacking. Still less is known of his chief political adviser, Cardinal Antonelli. The monographic literature on Pius is not generally of high quality. On the Gaeta period G. Mollat, *La question romaine de Pie VI à Pie XI* (Paris, 1932) gives the best account, but in conformity with its scope it is not built on primary sources. Nicomede Bianchi's thoroughly pro-Sardinian *Storia documentata della diplomazia Europea in Italia dall' anno 1814 all' anno 1861* (Torino, 1865-1872) made use of and also published *in extenso* reports of Italian diplomats. Incidental references to archival material are made in E. Bourgeois and E. Clermont, *Rome et Napoléon III* (Paris, 1907) and more frequently in that unique compilation from most of the great European archives, poorly organized, but indispensable, Vicomte de Guichen, *Les grandes questions Européennes et la diplomatie des puissances sous la seconde république Française* (Paris, 1925). Neither work, however, has exhausted the sources consulted. A systematic study has been made by A. J. P. Taylor, *The Italian Problem in European Diplomacy, 1847-1849* (Manchester, 1934), but he was not interested in the Roman Question primarily. A carefully prepared edition of the American diplomatic reports has been made by Leo Francis Stock, *United States Ministers to the Papal States, Instructions and Dispatches, 1848-1868* (Washington, 1933). The first American minister to the Papal States, Jacob L. Martin, met death on June 26, 1848, after writing but one report from Rome. His successor, Lewis Cass, Jr., was appointed on February 16, 1849, but due to the circumstances then prevailing in Rome he did not present his credentials to Cardinal Antonelli until November 21, 1849. The dispatches thus do not give much information concerning the diplomatic and political problems, but they contain valuable observations on the social and economic conditions of Rome during the years under discussion in this article, and they provide information on the rumors then current in the Pontificial States. For this article the writer has consulted the Oesterreichishes Staatsarchiv in Vienna for the period 1846-1850 (referred to as: St. A.), and the Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères in Paris (referred to as: AMAE) for the years 1846-1848. He wishes to express his sincere thanks to all those who generously gave him help and advice in both archives. He feels that he owes a special debt of gratitude to Countess Anna Coreth of the Staats-Archiv in Vienna. This article forms part of a larger study which is planned on the formative years of Pius IX, 1846-1850.

THE FRENCH PARISH AND *SURVIVANCE* IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY NEW ENGLAND

By

Mason Wade*

The foundation in 1850 of the first Franco-American parish, St. Joseph's of Burlington, Vermont, has been chosen somewhat arbitrarily as the basis for celebrating the centenary of the coming of the French Canadians to New England. Protests have been made by those who upheld the prior claims of the Madawaska parishes in Maine, the Abbé Ancé's church at Burlington in 1842, a mission at Littleton, New Hampshire in 1846, and the Abbé Zéphyrin Levesque's congregation at Worcester in the same year. No one has quarreled, however, with choosing the establishment of the first Franco-American parish as the real beginning of Franco-American life in the United States. The parish was the basic social unit of French Canada, religiously, scholastically, and municipally;[1] and it played an equally vital role, at least in the first two respects, among the French-Canadian immigrants in New England in the last century.[2] The controversy just mentioned reveals how strong the parochial spirit remains today. Therefore, this discussion of the religious aspects of the immigration will be centered upon the parish, and upon the three-fold concept of preservation of religion, language, and customs which is contained for French Canadians in the word *survivance*. The first half of the century, which might be called the dark ages of the French Canadians in New England, will be passed over rather rapidly, in order to do fuller justice to the more

* This article in its original form was read as a paper at the joint session of the American Catholic Historical Association and the American Historical Association, Boston, December 30, 1949. Mr. Wade is the author of *The French-Canadian Outlook* (New York, 1946), and of a forthcoming intellectual history of French Canada.

[1] J. C. Farlardeau, "Paroisses de France et de Nouvelle France au XVII• Siècle," *Cahiers de la Faculté des Sciences Sociales de Laval* (Quebec, 1943), II, 7: H. Miner, *Saint-Denis: A French Canadian Parish* (Chicago, 1937); J. C. Farlardeau, "The Parish as an Institutional Type," *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, XV, 3 (August, 1949), pp. 353-367.

[2] Josaphat Benoit, *L'Ame Franco-Américaine* (Montreal, 1935), pp. 93-114.

significant mission period from 1850 to 1868, and to the period of expansion and conflict from 1869 to 1900.

Though the first French-Canadian families were established at Winooski, Vermont, in 1814; at Woonsocket, Rhode Island, as early as 1814 or 1815; at Worcester, Massachusetts in 1820; at Manchester, New Hampshire, in 1830; at Lewiston, Maine, in 1831; and at Southbridge, Massachusetts, in 1832,[3] nowhere except in the Burlington-Winooski and Madawaska regions was there a notable concentration in the first half of the century. Thus the American religious history of the immigrants centers in Vermont, since the Madawaska parishes remained under the Bishop of Quebec until 1842, under the Bishop of St. John until 1852, and under the Bishop of Bathurst until 1870, when they became part of the Diocese of Portland.[4] Yet even in Vermont it is a joint Canadian-American history from the beginning. As early as April 8, 1801, Bishop Carroll accepted the offer of Bishop Denaut of Quebec to have his clergy minister to Canadian Catholics living near the boundary, and empowered his Quebec colleague to confirm in the United States.[5] In 1806 he accepted Bishop Plessis' proposal that a Canadian missionary should visit Lake Champlain, "where there are a great number of Catholics."[6] In 1811, three years after the Diocese of Boston, then embracing all New England, was established, Archbishop Carroll asked Bishop Plessis to continue work along the border, and for that purpose the Quebec bishop was made a vicar general of Boston, while Bishop

[3] J. F. Audet, *Histoire de la Congrégation Canadienne de Winooski au Vermont* (Montreal, 1906), p. 35; M. L. Bonier, *Débuts de la Colonie Franco-Américaine de Woonsocket, R. I.* (Framingham, 1920), p. 79; A. Belisle, *Livre d'Or des Franco-Américains de Worcester, Mass.* (Worcester, 1920), p. 15; W. H. Paradis, "French-Canadian Influence in Manchester, N. H., Before 1891," unpublished M.A. thesis, St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, 1949, p. 20; R. J. Lawton, J. H. Burgess, H. F. Roy, *Franco-Americans of the State of Maine* (Lewiston, 1915), p. 31; cited in M. L. Hansen and J. B. Brebner, *Mingling of the Canadian and American Peoples* (New Haven, 1940), p. 124; F. Gatineau, *Histoire des Franco-Américains de Southbridge* (Framingham, 1919), p. 3.

[4] T. Albert, *Histoire du Madawaska* (Quebec, 1920), pp. 243-248.

[5] J. G. Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1888), II, p. 442.

[6] *Rapport de l'archiviste de la province de Québec, 1929-30* (Quebec, 1931), p. 242, cited in Abbé Georges Robitaille, "L'Expansion religieuse des Canadiens Français aux Etats-Unis," in G. Lanctôt, *Les Canadiens Français et leurs Voisins du Sûd* (Montreal, 1941), p. 249.

Cheverus became a vicar general of Quebec.[7] When Bishop Plessis visited Boston and New York in 1815, he was accompanied on his return trip by Father François A. Matignon, the Boston pastor, and at Burlington they found about a hundred Canadian Catholics, who asked for a Canadian priest. Plessis said he had no power to grant their request, but Matignon promised to visit them on his return from Canada and on October 15 he baptized some eighteen children—all with French names.[8] With his enormous diocese boasting only three priests including himself, Cheverus was unable to spare one for Burlington, but he arranged through Plessis for the mission to be served from time to time by Abbé Pierre-Marie Mignault, curé of Chambly.[9] Mignault, who thus became the virtual founder of the Church in Vermont, reported on October 15, 1819 that he was planning to visit the east side of the lake as far as Vergennes, ending his trip at Burlington, for "The people of that district are very eager for my visit."[10] No Boston priest was resident in the state until 1830, and the Abbé Mignault frequently visited his scattered compatriots until the Diocese of Burlington was established in 1853, "always at his own expense and without remuneration, except for the pleasure of doing good," as Bishop John B. Fitzpatrick of Boston noted in 1846.[11]

Benedict J. Fenwick, the second Bishop of Boston, vainly sought French-speaking priests for Vermont and Maine in Montreal and Quebec in 1828.[12] He preached at Burlington in both English and French on December 12, 1830, when churches there and at Vergennes, St. Albans, and Swanton were being planned by Father Jeremiah O'Callaghan, the first resident priest, who had been charged with the Vermont mission in that year.[13] The Canadians of Burlington, for whom Fenwick ultimately hoped to provide a separate church, had a separate pastor, the Abbé Auguste Petithomme, from May, 1834, to October, 1835.[14] After the burning of Father O'Cal-

[7] Shea, *op. cit.*, II, 641-642. See also Abbé Ivanhoë Caron, "Msgr. Plessis et les évêques catholiques des Etats Unis," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, XXIII* (Ottawa, 1934), 132.

[8] Robert Lord, John F. Sexton, Edward T. Harrington, *History of the Archdiocese of Boston, 1604-1943* (New York, 1944), I, 687-688.

[9] *Ibid.*, I, 704.

[10] *Ibid.*, I, 737.

[11] *Ibid.*, II, 104-105.

[12] Shea, *op. cit.*, III, 154.

[13] Lord, *et al.*, *op. cit.*, II, 107.

[14] *Ibid.*, II, 148.

laghan's church, St. Mary's, in 1838, the Canadians began to think of building a church of their own. Stimulated by the dedication of O'Callaghan's new church and by the visit of the Bishop of Nancy in the fall of 1841, they held a meeting on October 12 and passed resolutions in favor of building a church and of obtaining a French-speaking priest.[15] On November 5 Bishop Fenwick replied to R. S. M. Bouchette, the secretary of the group which was headed by Ludger Duvernay—both men were refugees from the Papineau Rebellion of 1837 in Canada—that he favored the plan, and that he would write to Montreal for a Canadian priest. The same day he wrote to Bishop Bourget, speaking of the Canadians' determination "to have a church in Burlington, as well as the American or Irish Catholics, a church in which they may have a Canadian priest to officiate for them, and to deliver to them and their families the word of God in their own mother tongue." Fenwick noted that in addition to more than a thousand of them at Burlington, they were also to be found in "a hundred other places," and that he feared that they might relapse into their "former apathy and despondency" if they did not receive a Canadian priest.[16] Bourget replied on December 1 that unless a French priest who had accompanied the Bishop of Nancy remained in Burlington, he would be unable to do more than send a priest there three or four times a year. In February, 1842, however, the Abbé François Ancé arrived to take charge of the Canadians "in that part of the State of Vermont bordering on Lake Champlain."[17] But this effort to establish a separate French parish, like the earlier one, proved unfortunate; before the end of 1842 Ancé had returned temporarily to Montreal after being deprived of his faculties by Bishop Fenwick, and in October, 1843, he left the

[15] Bishop Fenwick's Journal, November 5, 1841. I am indebted to the Reverend Robert H. Lord for copies of the bishop's correspondence concerning this matter.

[16] E. Chartier, "Les Canadiens Français et les Evêques de Boston," *Bulletin des recherches historiques,* XXXIX, 1 (Jan., 1933), pp. 12-13. In both this printed version and in the copy from the Montreal Diocesan Archives in the Boston Diocesan Archives, Fenwick's letter of Nov. 5, 1841, to Bouchette is addressed to "*A.* S. M. Bouchette." The initial is correctly given as "R." in Fenwick's Journal for the same date.

[17] Bourget-Fenwick, December 1, 1841; Archives of the Diocese of Boston, Fenwick's Journal, February 8, 1842.

Diocese of Boston for good.[18] The Canadian chapel was sold and the congregation reunited with the Irish and Yankee converts of the new St. Peter's, which later came to be known by the old name of St. Mary's.[19]

After these false starts, a successful one was made in the spring of 1850, when the Canadian colony had been swollen by new immigrants from the Richelieu parishes attracted by the establishment of the Burlington Woolen Mill Company.[20] Abbé Mignault brought Father Joseph Quévillon from Montreal to minister to the Burlington flock. Quévillon said Mass for 300 of them on April 28 in the old court house, and immediately afterward a meeting was held under the chairmanship of Abbé Mignault. A petition to Bishop Fitzpatrick for a separate parish was then drafted,[21] and a committee of laymen, including one Captain N. Tucker, was named to choose a site and build a church. That same day the committee, with Mignault lending them his authority as vicar general, marked out a site on the land given for the first St. Mary's by Colonel Archibald Hyde, who had been treasurer of the committee for the French church in 1841. But the Irish Catholics opposed the division of the parish and refused to cede the chosen site. Captain Tucker, a personal friend of the bishop, pleaded the French cause in Boston, with the result that the division was approved, though the land question was left open. Another Canadian meeting on July 21 resolved that "considering the opposition of the Irish of this city to the Canadians building on the old land given by Colonel Hyde to the Roman Catholic congregation for the building of a church, it was expedient for the maintenance of peace between the two congregations to yield this right, in truth indeed due, but which might later be a subject of disorder and of scandal for the faith and for our separated brethren."[22] Another site was acquired on a hill halfway between Burlington and Winooski, and the cornerstone of the new church was blessed on August 22, 1850, in the presence of Abbé Mignault

[18] Chartier, *op. cit.*, p. 14; A.A.B., Fenwick's Journal, October 21, 1843.

[19] Lord, *op. cit.*, II, p. 276; E. Hamon, *Les Canadiens Français de la Nouvelle-Angleterre* (Quebec, 1891), pp. 183-184; Archives of the Diocese of Burlington.

[20] Audet, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

[21] Hamon, *op. cit.*, pp. 184-185, gives the text.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 186.

and Father Quévillon. The new church was dedicated to St. Joseph on June 1, 1851.

The early history of St. Joseph's is typical of many another Franco-American parish in its record of friction between the French Canadians and their Irish co-religionists. Such friction seems to have arisen in the middle years of the century as increasing numbers of French-Canadian immigrants came in the wake of the Irish immigrants of the 1820's, 1830's, and 1840's. It did not exist earlier, for in the opening years of the century "the Irish congregation in Boston had no anti-French feeling."[24] French priests had founded and fostered the Church in New England, and the chaplains of Rochambeau's squadron had helped to weaken eighteenth-century anti-"papist" feeling in New England. But the new Irish immigrant did not share the attitude of his predecessors. Though looked down upon by the Yankee as a foreign "papist," he spoke the language of the country and soon made himself at home here. The Irishman tended to look down in turn upon the more recent French-Canadian immigrant, who was still more foreign because he spoke another language, and who also represented an economic threat to the Irishman because of his willingness to work harder and longer for less pay. Though Irish and French Canadians shared the same faith, their differences of religious customs and parochial habits, of language and temperament, were such as to cause Father Audet, the founder of the French parish of Winooski, to speculate whether God was going to separate them in heaven.[25] Aside from the difficulty that the French Canadian found in confessing his sins in English and in trying to follow an English sermon, he missed the Gregorian chant and the full measure of solemnity in religious rites traditional in Quebec in a virtually established Church, but largely scanted in New England in deference to Yankee prejudice against "popish pageantry." There was also an economic question. Many a poor immigrant found, in his own words, that *il en coûte bien cher pour faire sa religion aux Etats.*[26] Seat money, baptismal, marriage, and formal offerings, and Christmas and Easter collections for the pastor were all on a higher scale or new burdens to the French Canadian, who had lived under

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 186-187; Lord, *op. cit.*, II, p. 571.

[24] Lord, *op. cit.*, I, p. 698.

[25] Audet, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

[26] Hamon, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

a well-endowed Church in Quebec and who found that he had little say in parish affairs in the new country. His reluctance to contribute, coupled with the fact that he was crowding churches raised at bitter cost by the earlier Irish immigrants, made him unpopular with Irish pastors, sometimes rough-spoken and often insensitive to French susceptibilties. Father O'Callaghan, the first pastor of Burlington, whose objections to such current economic practices as interest-taking did not extend to church contributions, used to read from the pulpit the names of those who had given to the Christmas collection for the pastor in this style: "Frank Leclaire of Winooski. Frank is a Frenchman, but not like the rest; he is a gentleman. Thank you, Frank: God bless you."[27] This François Leclaire, despite such public favor, took a leading role in the foundation of St. Joseph's and of the new French parish at Winooski in 1868.[28] There was a temperamental incompatibility between French and Irish, reinforced by each group's racial prejudices, strong group consciousness, and mutual aid tendencies, which led to the demand for separate French parishes as soon as the French Canadians were numerous enough to support them. Before these parishes were established, many Canadians ceased to practice their religion rather than to frequent what they called *les églises irlandaises*. Bishop Louis de Goësbriand records meeting descendants of the first immigrants who had lived for twenty or thirty years in the States when there were no Canadian parishes and few Catholic churches, and who had grown up in complete ignorance of the faith,[29] while returned emigrants shocked their Canadian curés by revealing that they had not frequented the sacraments for years.[30]

Since the opinion was widely held in Canada that the emigrant chose to abandon his faith as well as his country,[31] the Quebec clergy long remained deaf to the reiterated calls for French-speaking priests to care for the religious needs of the New England immigrants. When the exodus could no longer be ignored, about the middle of the century, the Quebec clergy launched agricultural coloni-

[27] Audet, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-40.

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 40, 42.

[29] Hamon, *op. cit.*, p. 174.

[30] D. M. A. Magnan, *Histoire de la race française aux Etats-Unis* (Paris, 1912), p. 256.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 256.

zation movements for the emigrants, who were to be established either in the province or in the American Middle West, since "as day laborers in cities and factory towns they lost everything that Canadians held highest: religion, language, and nationality—all of which might be preserved under the American as well as the British flag if the emigrants were concentrated in farming communities, preferably in the West where society was still in the process of formation."[32] A handful of Quebec priests, however, were fired by missionary zeal and followed the growing tide of migrants to New England. In October, 1846, Father Zéphyrin Levesque of Quebec offered his services to Bishop Fitzpatrick of Boston and after making a census of the French Canadians of Worcester and its neighborhood, he was placed in charge of the 150 families he found there, as well as of "the Canadian Catholics of Manchester, N. H., and those of other places."[33] In January, 1847, he visited Vermont and Rhode Island, but failing health forced him to retire to New Orleans after six months of laboring—in Fitzpatrick's words—"with much zeal and success amongst the Canadians throughout the diocese."[34] By October, 1851, however, he was back as pastor of the mixed parish of Millbury, near Worcester, which he used as headquarters for his work among his scattered compatriots.[35] Father Hector Drolet, a New Brunswick missionary returning to Canada, was recruited by Fitzpatrick in January, 1850, and promptly sent off to Vermont where he established a parish in Montpelier in November, after reporting that the people were pleased with the idea of a resident priest and willing to build a church.[36] Father Napoléon Mignault, perhaps a relative of the zealous Curé of Chambly since he hailed from the same region, was made pastor of Webster, Massachusetts, and of the Canadians of that vicinity. Under him Worcester's forty French-Canadian families bought a lot and started to build a church soon after his arrival in November, 1852. The effort proved too ambitious for their means, and after various vicissitudes the church begun by the Canadians was finally dedicated in 1858 as St. Anne's. Though an English parish, it was much frequented by the Canadians

[32] *Mélanges Religieux* (Montreal), August 22, 1851; cited in Hansen and Brebner, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

[33] Lord, *op. cit.*, II, p. 533; Belisle, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

[34] Lord, *ibid.*

[35] *Ibid.*, II, p. 534; Belisle, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

[36] Lord, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 571-572.

until they finally achieved a parish of their own in 1869, when Father J. B. Primeau founded Notre Dame des Canadiens.[37] Father O. H. Noiseaux, who began visiting the Canadian centers of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine in the 1840's,[38] replaced Father Mignault at Worcester and served the Canadians as assistant at St. John's until 1857.[39] Subsequently he was missionary to the scattered French Canadians of New Hampshire, from the Ashuelot to Colebrook, and pastor of Littleton.[40] Mignault finished a church at Webster in 1853 and built another at Oxford in 1856. In that year he said Mass "at Oxford and North Oxford once a month, at each of the Brookfields once every six weeks, at Warren and New Braintree twice a year."[41] The record of these hardy pioneers, who ministered to scattered flocks in several states in the early days of the railroad and before the automobile, is incomplete but nonetheless eloquent.

What I have called the dark ages really came to a close with the foundation of St. Joseph's in 1850 and the erection of the See of Burlington in 1853, when the Diocese of Portland was also established, taking in New Hampshire as well as Maine. There seems to have been a project in 1848, hatched by the French Abbé Charles-Etienne Brasseur de Bourbourg, who had served briefly in Quebec and Boston after ordination in Rome in 1845, for the creation of a see to comprise Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, with its center at Burlington or Bangor and himself as bishop.[42] Rome acted, however, on the recommendation of the First Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1852, and Louis de Goësbriand, the Breton-born vicar general of Cleveland, was chosen Bishop of Burlington. He was consecrated on October 30, 1852, in New York by Archbisohp Gaetano Bedini, the nuncio who had been sent to inquire into the trustee troubles, and who after his violent reception by the nativists strongly advised Rome against the appointment of foreign-born bishops on

[37] Lord, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 534-535; Belisle, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-21, 25-27.

[38] Paradis, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

[39] Belisle, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

[40] J. R. Jackson, *History of Littleton, New Hampshire* (Cambridge, 1905), II, pp. 335-336.

[41] Lord, *op. cit.*, II, p. 542.

[42] Lord, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 421-422.

the basis of racial proportions.[43] The new bishop was accompanied to Burlington by Bishop Fitzpatrick who had been his schoolmate at St. Sulpice (Paris), and by Father O'Callaghan. They were met at the station by several thousand Catholics headed by Abbé Mignault who now retired from his long apostolate to the French Canadians of Vermont.[44] His compatriots at last had a bishop whose language was their own, and who was to do much for them during an episcopate which ended only with the century.

After surveying his flock, grouped in seven churches though he had only two priests to help him, Bishop de Goësbriand like his Boston predecessors appealed to Canada for priests. Noting the successful missionary work of the Oblates among the French Canadians of northern New York,[45] the bishop called upon their provincial in Montreal for missionaries to take over St. Joseph's and to work among their compatriots throughout Vermont. Father Augustin Gaudet was installed as pastor of St. Joseph's and director of the new Oblate house on October 22, 1854, with Father Eugène Cauvin as assistant. But the Oblates gave up this charge on January 12, 1857, when a choice had to be made on economic grounds between abandoning their Plattsburg or their Burlington house. Since Plattsburg was nearer headquarters in Montreal, and missionaries could visit Vermont on their way to the new French-Canadian centers around Boston, Burlington was sacrificed.[46] Failing to find the help he needed in Canada, the bishop sought priests in Europe and returned in 1855 with seven Bretons, Fathers Salin, Picard, Daniélou, Dugue, Cloarec, Cam and Clavier.[47] Another French priest, Zéphyrin Druon, who had served in Cleveland with the bishop, entered the

[43] Theodore Maynard, *The Story of American Catholicism* (New York, 1941), p. 300.

[44] Lord, *op. cit.*, II, p. 423; Archives of the Diocese of Burlington, Goësbriand's Diary, copy at St. Michael's College, Winooski.

[45] As delegate of Bishop John McCloskey of Albany, Goësbriand blessed the cornerstone of the Oblate parish in Plattsburg in May, 1854. H. Morisseau, "Les Oblats de Marie-Immaculée dans la Nouvelle-Angleterre," *Le Travailleur* (Worcester), May 26, 1949.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

[47] Hamon, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

diocese early in 1854 and shared his superior's concern for the French Canadians.[48]

Aside from the Oblates and the Sisters of Providence of Montreal who answered Bishop de Goësbriand's first call, Quebec continued to pay little heed to the religious needs of its exiled sons and daughters, as the Civil War and the post-war boom brought an ever-swelling tide of French Canadians to New England. Soldiers and millhands were actively recruited in Quebec, and visiting his diocese in the summer of 1864 the bishop found the roads choked with "carts filled with Canadian families headed toward some of the many mills to which they were drawn by the hope of bettering their condition."[49] Confronted with the even greater post-war immigration, Bishop de Goësbriand made a new appeal in Montreal and Quebec early in 1869 for the Canadian priests whom both he and Bishop John J. Williams of Boston wanted to care for the immigrants. The appeal he made in Canada was printed on May 13, 1869, in *Le Protecteur Canadien,* a newspaper founded a year earlier at St. Albans by Alfred Moussette, organizer of the first New England national convention of the French Canadians at Springfield, October 7, 1868, and Father Druon, now pastor of St. Albans and vicar general of the diocese.[50] In this eloquent appeal, which was echoed in the years that followed, the bishop estimated the number of French Canadians in the States at more than 500,000, with the number in his own diocese more than doubled in the last three years. He was among the first to see that this was no mere seasonal movement, as in the past, and that only a few of the immigrants would return to Canada, since thousands had "taken root in a foreign soil by the ties of property, by marriages contracted here, and by the jobs they fill." He was also the first to advance the theory that the migration, long regarded as a plague in Canada, might be intended by Providence for a high end. "We believe these emigrants are called by God to cooperate in the conversion of America," he said, "as their ancestors were called upon to plant the Faith on the shores of St. Lawrence." They needed missionaries of their own stock:

[48] Belisle, *op. cit.,* pp. 25-27; *Histoire de la Presse Franco-Américaine et des Canadiens-Français aux Etats-Unis* (Worcester, 1911), pp. 66-67.

[49] L. de Goësbriand, *Les Canadiens des Etats-Unis,* p. 3.

[50] Belisle, *Presse,* pp. 61-62.

God in His Providence wishes that nations be evangelized, at least as a general rule, by apostles who speak their language, who know their habits and disposition; that nations be evangelized by priests of their own nationality.

His experience had taught him that the French Canadians needed churches of their own, since they did not feel at home in other Catholic churches and were reluctant to support them; but given churches of their own, "the liberality of these poor immigrants" was "astonishing." If Canadian missionaries were supplied, "religion would become as flourishing among them as in Canada."[51]

This appeal, which played upon themes dear to the Canadian heart, brought results. Father Louis M. Gagnier came from Montreal to East Rutland to found the mission of which the bishop still dreamed, despite the unsuccessful Oblate experience: "It seems to us that a missionary house should be established in some central place, which would not only serve a parish, but give retreats in Canadian centers and help to found parishes as a group became numerous enough to construct a church and maintain a priest."[52] He was joined by Fathers Pelletier and Lavoie of Quebec, who were to serve additional churches at West Rutland and Fairhaven, and the Sisters of Jesus and Mary, who started a school at East Rutland. Fathers Gendreau and Audet of St. Hyacinthe, and Fathers Verdier and Boissonault also responded to the call.[53] But the hopes for the new missionary center were not realized, and in 1870 Gagnier left Vermont for the Diocese of Springfield which had been established in that year. Eight French Canadian priests came to Massachusetts in 1869 as a result of de Goësbriand's appeal, and Bishop Williams no longer needed to remark: "The harvest is great, but the workers rare."[54] Though after 1869 the great development of French parishes took place in the teeming new "Little Canadas" of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island, Vermont saw French parishes established at St. Albans in 1871, at Alburg in 1872, and at Montgomery in 1890, while many others were mixed parishes in which both languages were used in the pulpit and in the schools.[55] Under the hand of Bishop de Goësbriand

[51] Hamon, *op. cit.*, pp. 172-176.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 170.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 205; Belisle, *Presse*, p. 62.

[54] Belisle, *Livre*, p. 21; Lord, *op. cit.*, II, p. 202.

[55] Hamon, *op. cit.*, p. 227.

and his successor Bishop Michaud, born in Burlington of an Acadian father and an Irish mother, the diocese passed almost painlessly through the transition from French Canadian to Franco-American which troubled other dioceses badly.

The development which in Vermont was spread over the whole century was telescoped into thirty or forty years in the other New England states, and consequently was not as peaceful. Except for the Madawaska parishes in Maine, the French Canadians were not among the first Catholics and at first they were a minority, instead of being on equal numerical terms with their English-speaking brethren as in Vermont. Worcester and Woonsocket were the only French centers which had traditions nearly as old as Burlington and Winooski. But soon Waterville, Lewiston, and Biddeford, Maine; Manchester, Nashua, Suncock, Rochester, and Berlin, New Hampshire; Lowell, Lawrence, Lynn, Salem, Fitchburg, Gardner, Spencer, Holyoke, Northampton, Adams, Pittsfield, Taunton, and Fall River, Massachusetts; Providence, Center Falls, Pawtucket, Rhode Island; and Putnam, Willimantic, and Waterbury, Connecticut, had notable French colonies.

The record of the foundation of French parishes reflects the flow and ebb of migration which, in turn, reflected the North American economic picture.[56] In 1869 seven parishes were established, two in Vermont, four in Massachusetts, one in Maine. In 1870 three, all in Massachusetts. In 1871 six, one each in Vermont and Maine, and four in Massachusetts. In 1872 seven, one each in Vermont, Maine, and Rhode Island and two each in New Hampshire and Massachusetts. In 1873 seven, four in Massachusetts, two in Rhode Island, and one in New Hampshire. The depression in the United States then made itself felt, with only one parish established each year until 1878—two in Massachusetts, two in Rhode Island, one in Vermont—and none at all in 1879. The boom which began in the summer of 1879 was reflected by the establishment of three parishes in 1880, two in New Hampshire and one in Connecticut. In 1881 two were established, one in Massachusetts and one in New Hampshire; in 1882 one in Rhode Island; and in 1883 one in Massachusetts. After acute depression in Canada had fostered a new exodus, six parishes were founded in 1884, two in New Hampshire, three in Massachusetts, and one in Connecticut. In 1885 three more, in 1886 two more, and

[56] Hansen and Brebner, *op. cit.*, pp. 168-215.

in 1887 one more, all in Massachusetts. In 1888 there were two foundations, in Maine and Connecticut; and in 1889 one in Massachusetts. In 1890 the increase of old colonies and the influx of new immigrants resulted in the establishment of four new parishes in Massachusetts, and one each in Maine, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island. By 1891, at the end of the great period of expansion which closed with depression in the United States and returning prosperity in Canada, there were in New England eighty-six Franco-American parishes, with fifty-three parochial schools attended by 25,000 children, not to mention many other institutions.[57] The Diocese of Springfield led the list with twenty-two parishes, Portland was second with seventeen, Providence third with fourteen, and Manchester fourth with eleven, while Boston with nine, Burlington with eight, and Hartford with five brought up the rear.[58]

The men who led this extraordinary effort, which is matched by no other ethnic group in the Church of the United States, were extraordinary men. Only some of the more notable among them can be mentioned here. Father Louis Gagnier founded or organized eleven parishes in Vermont and Massachusetts before coming to rest at St. Joseph's, Springfield, Massachusetts, where he was pastor for more than twenty years.[59] Father Charles Dauray made Woonsocket, of which he remained pastor until 1930, one of the great Franco-American strongholds.[60] The redoubtable Father J. P. Bédard made a lasting mark on Fall River in his ten stormy years there.[61] Father Joseph Augustin Chevalier achieved such wonders in an anti-Catholic Manchester as renting a Baptist church to house his congregation, persuading the city fathers to maintain his parochial schools and the Amoskeag Company to give land for his church, and taking over an abandoned public school for his parochial one. He and his colleague-rival, Father Pierre Hévey, played a major part in making Manchester a close competitor of Worcester and Woonsocket for the

[57] Magnan, *op. cit.*, pp. 269-272, 284.

[58] Hamon, *op. cit.*, pp. 179-421.

[59] *Ibid.*, pp. 173, 273-275.

[60] A. Kennedy, *Quebec to New England* (Boston, 1948), pp. 43-51, 117-118; Hamon, *op. cit.*, pp. 327-331.

[61] Magnan, *Notre Dame de Lourdes de Fall River, Massachusetts* (Quebec, 1925), pp. 34-56.

title of Franco-American capital of New England.[62] Aside from these diocesan priests, the Oblates played the most notable role among the religious orders who came from Canada. Under Father André Garin, St. Joseph's in Lowell became a missionary center in 1869 from which St. Anne's, Lawrence, and St. Joseph's, Haverhill, were founded in 1871, and the French Canadians of many other towns served until resident priests were found for them.[63] The French Dominicans of St. Hyacinthe, who only came to Canada in 1873, took over St. Pierre, Lewiston, in 1881 and St. Anne's, Fall River, in 1888.[64] The Marists, another French order, began their work among the Franco-Americans at St. Anne's, Lowell, in 1882; at Notre Dame des Victoires, Boston, in 1884; and at St. Bruno's, Van Buren, Maine, where they established a college, in the same year.[65] Canadian nuns of many orders, notably the Soeurs de St. Croix, the Soeurs Grises, the Soeurs de Ste. Anne, and the Soeurs de Jésus-Marie, were conducting forty parochial schools by 1890.[66]

This rapid development of French parishes, usually with a full complement of parochial schools, convents, religious and national societies, and close connections with the French press, did not take place without friction with both the original Yankees, who feared that New England was becoming New France, and with the Irish Catholics, who had quickly taken a dominant role in the Church in New England. The immigration from Canada first took on notable proportions and the first French parishes were established, just as anti-Catholic feeling exploded in the Know-Nothing movement, which swept New England in 1854-1856.[67] To the old eighteenth-century hatred of Catholics and foreigners had been added the new hatred bred by the nativist movement which grew steadily from the 1820's onward, feeding on fear of the immigrant, "not only as a Catholic, but as a menace to the economic, political, and social structure which Americans had reared with such care."[68] This "Protestant Crusade" of

[62] Paradis, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-53; A. Verrette, *Messire Chevalier* (Manchester, 1929), *Paroisse Ste. Marie* (Manchester, 1931).

[63] Morriseau, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

[64] Hamon, *op. cit.*, pp. 314, 405; Robitaille, *op. cit.*, p. 257.

[65] Hamon, *op. cit.*, pp. 376-377; Albert, *op. cit.*, p. 423.

[66] Hamon, *op. cit.*, pp. 468-471.

[67] Ray A. Billington, *The Protestant Crusade* (New York, 1938), pp. 430-431.

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

the 1850's was professedly sectarian, but it rested upon the political basis of changing institutions and upon the economic basis of the immigrant's challenge to the individual Yankee's security.

When the newcomers from Canada began to make themselves felt in New England communities, the average Protestant American had been conditioned from birth to hate Catholicism.[69] Anti-Catholic feeling had already led to the burning of the Ursuline Convent at Charlestown in 1834; to the school troubles of New York and Maine in the early 1850's; to the Bedini-Gavazzi riots of 1853-1854, when the nuncio was burnt in effigy on Boston Common and threatened at Bishop Fitzpatrick's home; and to the infamous Massachusetts Nunnery Committee of 1885.[70] Solidarity among foreigners was viewed with suspicion, particularly when it was Catholic solidarity, for "Nativists who thought that priests bartered the political power of their parishioners for favors and protection for Catholicism were afraid that this unholy alliance would spell the doom of both Protestantism and democracy."[71] It is not surprising that in this intellectual climate the Irish Catholics, who had borne the brunt of anti-Catholicism thus far, were unenthusiastic about the establishment of foreign language or so-called "national" parishes with foreign language schools. The French Canadians were much more zealous than the Irish in founding parochial schools, both because of a different tradition in their homeland and because they saw in such schools a means to keep their language and customs, as well as their religion, alive. The Irish believed that rapid Americanization of foreign-born Catholics would ease anti-Catholic feeling. They thought that the French Canadians were dividing rather than strengthening the Church and creating new anti-Catholic feeling. The rigid authoritarianism of some Irish prelates and pastors, acting on these principles, grated on the individualistic French Canadians, whose cohesive tendencies as an ethnic group, whose insistence on preserving their language and customs, and whose love of the full measure of religious solemnity separated them from those whom they soon came to call the "Irish assimilators."

This dual conflict, implicit in the environment, came to a head in the last two decades of the century, though there were earlier skirmishes. The French Catholic troubles have received less historical notice than the Irish ones, because they were characterized by verbal

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 345. [70] *Ibid.*, p. 302. [71] *Ibid.*, p. 327.

rather than physical violence, but they were bitter nonetheless. In the early days there were numerous incidents of Yankee refusals to sell land or abandoned Protestant churches to the new French Canadian congregations. Such refusals were circumvented by purchases through dummies.[72] Protestant missionary activity among the immigrants often created minor disturbances. It was started by the American Protestant Society in the 1840's[73] and continued by preachers of the French Canadian Missionary Society, established in Montreal in 1850, who were driven from Quebec in the heyday of Bishops Bourget and Laflèche, and continued their activity in the New England French centers.[74] Narcisse Cyr, the Baptist missionary, was at work in Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts in 1869-1873, before he settled in Boston.[75] T. G. A. Côté began proselytizing for the Congregationalists in Lowell and Springfield in 1878, while the Baptists were active in Waterville, Burlington, and Grafton, Massachusetts, at the same period.[76] But these French Protestants, known as *les Chiniquy* or *les Suisses,* found little aid from their Yankee coreligionists until the late 1880's, for they, too, were unforgivably foreign.[77]

The great Montreal St. Jean Baptiste celebration in June, 1874, attended by 10,000 Franco-Americans and the leaders of their national societies,[78] disturbed some Yankees by its revelation of the number of the immigrants and of their divided loyalty. So did such utterances as Ferdinand Gagnon's *Loyaux, oui, Français toujours,*[79] and Father Primeau's *Avant tout, soyons Canadiens.*[80] The first notable disclosure of Yankee anti-French Canadian feeling came in 1881, with the publication of the *Twelfth Annual Report* of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor which referred to the French

[72] Lord, *op. cit.,* II, pp. 163, 534; Belisle, *Livre,* p. 20.

[73] Billington, *op. cit.,* pp. 245, 258 n. 28.

[74] R. P. Duclos, *Histoire du Protestantisme Français au Canada et aux Etats-Unis* (Montreal, n.d.), II, p. 211.

[75] *Ibid.,* II, p. 215.

[76] *Ibid., Baptist Home Mission Monthly,* May, 1878; April, 1879. I am indebted to Mrs. Iris Saunders Podea for the references to this publication.

[77] C. E. Amaron, *Your Heritage: or New England Threatened* (Springfield, 1891), pp. 76-77.

[78] Belisle, *Presse,* pp. 88-91, 113-115.

[79] Hamon, *op. cit.,* p. 70.

[80] Belisle, *Livre,* p. 48.

Canadians as "the Chinese of the Eastern States," in citing them as an obstacle to the adoption of the ten-hour day. It also censured their moral character, their lack of respect for American institutions, their failure to become naturalized, and their opposition to education.[81]

At the hearing which was forced by vigorous Franco-American protests, Colonel Carroll D. Wright, the chief of the bureau and the compiler of the offending report, asked Father J. B. V. Milette of Nashua how the establishment of French parishes affected the permanency of the immigrants. Milette replied, "It brings on what in Canada was feared . . . when we priests were sent to the States to attend to their spiritual needs, it was only then that they saw what the result of their action [was], and that they could not hold the French among them. The permanency of the French population was served." Father Bédard of Fall River also declared that the influence of the Church favored permanent establishment and opposed repatriation. The report's strictures on the morals of the immigrants were elaborately refuted by employers, prominent citizens, and law officers. In summing up the proceedings Colonel Wright concluded:

> The priest coming from Canada, it may be on missionary work, to take charge of the growing parish, soon found himself permanently established in New England, and his natural desire was to see his flock grow and prosper . . . with strong French churches established in New England, repatriation is a failure.
>
> However much the effort of the French to educate their children in these institutions may be applauded, the parochial school will always excite hostility on the part of the native . . . their establishment by the members of any race will always raise suspicion in the American mind as to the sincerity of professions of loyalty to our government on the part of the founders.[82]

Wright was undoubtedly correct on both counts: the establishment of French parishes meant the permanent settling of the Franco-Americans, despite continued efforts of the Canadian government and clergy to repatriate them; and the French parochial schools have ever since remained a bone of contention.

The publicity given this affair, and the realization that New England was becoming in good part French-Canadian, roused a new nativist reaction, in which the French Protestant missionaries played

[81] *Thirteenth Annual Report* (Boston, 1882), pp. 3ff.

[82] *Ibid.*, pp. 28-31, 90-91.

a part, despite their own recent arrival and foreign antecedents. The new Protestant crusade of the late 1880's and early 1890's was in part a reaction against the Irish Catholics' capture of political control in Boston and New York and against a sense of being swamped by foreigners. But the crusade was stimulated by the influx of Scotch-Irish from Canada and Britain at this period, and the clerical leaders of this group regarded the French Protestants as useful allies, as they had been in Canada.[83]

The Reverend Calvin E. Amaron, the son of Swiss missionaries to the French of Canada, president of the French Protestant International College at Springfield, editor of its organ, *Le Semeur Franco-Américain* (later *Le Citoyen Franco-Américain*), and successor of the Reverend T. G. A. Côté as pastor of the French Protestants of Lowell, was the foreigner who sounded the loudest nativist trumpet call about the French menace.[84] His early efforts in the Lowell press and in a book mildly entitled *The Evangelization of the French Canadians* (Lowell, 1885) had little effect at first. He sadly reported that "the pastors of our churches think they have something else to do than to attack the Roman Catholic Church."[85] But with the adoption of more alarmist tactics—the second edition of his book appeared in 1891 as *Your Heritage: or New England Threatened* (Springfield, 1891)—he had more success. He failed, however, to convince ex-Governor Sawyer of New Hampshire, who had attended the national convention at Nashua in 1888 from which Amaron was excluded, that this "anti-Protestant, anti-American, and revolutionary" gathering had "a hidden purpose which was inimical to the Republic and its institutions."[86] Since President Cleveland, a Presbyterian, sent a letter regretting his inability to be present as planned, it is doubtful whether the Reverend Mr. Amaron's alarm was generally shared.[87]

But Amaron put into print the dark fears which had arisen in the back of many Yankee minds. He warned that "The French are here in large numbers and are increasing at a fabulous rate and will soon have outnumbered you." He described them as "a foreign state within

[83] Lord, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 101ff.

[84] Duclos, *op. cit.*, II, p. 197.

[85] Amaron, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

[86] *Ibid.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-107.

[87] F. Gatineau, *Historique des Conventions Générales* (Woonsocket, 1927), p. 248.

your state," which had failed to imbibe "the spirit of your Protestant republican institutions" and had remained "monarchical and priest-ridden," a group who were "creating a New France in your midst."[88] Unlike Francis Parkman, who believed that "our system of common schools is the best for Catholics as well as Protestants,"[89] Mr. Amaron regarded the public schools as "liberalizing influences" which might free the French Canadians from their "old dogmatism," but would only convert them into "rank infidels." In evangelizing them lay "their happiness and prosperity and the safety of the nation," and he outlined measures to keep New England "Protestant and American."[90] He attacked the French clergy as "the uncompromising foe of our Protestant American civilization," and the parochial school as a "menace to republican institutions" and as the "most efficient barrier to prevent unification of the two races in New England," threatening to bring about in the United States a repetition of the religio-ethnic quarrels of Canada.[91] Considering his hyperpatriotic line, it is surprising to find Amaron prefacing his argument with the hope that "a great religious movement on this side of the lines will exert a very great reflex influence upon the Dominion of Canada, and help mightily in freeing it from the weight of an ecclesiastical tyranny unsurpassed in any part of the world";[92] and concluding it with a plea for separate French Protestant churches. Although his arguments for separate churches were singularly like the French Catholic ones, he held that Protestant churches would further unification of the races, instead of preventing it, since they would bring the French "into contact with Protestant influences, and this is all that is necessary to make of them true Christian citizens, loyal to the constitution of the nation."[93]

This new Protestant crusade, at first mainly a Congregationalist and then a Baptist effort, although the Methodists were also active in Manchester, Lowell, and Worcester,[94] was largely unsuccessful, like the whole home mission movement among Catholic immigrants,

[88] Amaron, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-4.
[89] F. Parkman, *Our Common Schools* (Boston, 1890).
[90] Amaron, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-4.
[91] *Ibid.*, pp. 66-69, 56, 93-97.
[92] *Ibid.*, p. ix.
[93] *Ibid.*, p. 143.
[94] Duclos, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 221-223.

and for much the same reasons.[95] Religion was identified with group loyalty and ethnic identity for the Franco-American to an unusually great extent. *Survivance,* preservation of religion, language, and customs, had become an obsession with the French Canadians, as a result of more than a century's struggle to maintain their identity under British rule in Canada. The concept still preoccupies today many Franco-Americans who have retained a minority mentality. The whole Protestant missionary effort probably did more to strengthen the potent cohesive tendency of the Franco-Americans, who like their brothers in Canada are never more united than when attacked, and to stimulate nativism and anti-Catholicism among the Yankees, than to win converts. The files of the *Baptist Home Mission Monthly* from 1878 to 1900 record mainly scattered conversions and little success. One missionary commented: "Our work among the French in New England has at times, and to some, seemed almost barren of results."[96] The lot of the Protestant missionary or convert was not a happy one in the "Little Canadas," as street meetings were broken up, churches attacked, and converts ostracized and boycotted.[97] Such incidents occurred because the French Canadian who turned Protestant was regarded as a traitor to his race as well as to his faith.

The Haverhill school case in 1888-1889 indicated how nativist feeling turned against the Franco-Americans at this period. The Haverhill school board tolerated the establishment of an Irish parochial school, St. James', in September, 1887, but objected from the first to the foundation of a French one, St. Joseph's, under Canadian nuns in the following year. The school was condemned on January 10, 1888, on the grounds that half the instruction was given in French and that various subjects required in the public schools were not taught. In February six parents were brought to court, charged with having sent their children to an unapproved school. Three pleaded guilty and paid fines, while the others contested the charge. On February 9 Judge Carter demolished the school board's position, declaring that "the legislature has always refused to deny the right of parents to send children to the school of their choice." The French defendants were discharged, and the fines already levied repaid. But the verdict

[95] T. Abel, *Protestant Home Missions to Catholic Immigrants* (New York, 1935), pp. 104-105.

[96] *Baptist Home Missionary Monthly,* October, 1886, p. 241.

[97] *Ibid.,* April, 1889, p. 96; June, 1894; December, 1897, p. 410.

was not a popular one; it was greeted by courtroom comments that Haverhill stood on the brink of another St. Bartholomew's, which somehow also involved "anarchy and socialism," and the judge was accused of "having gone over to that demon, Rome."[98]

Aside from these conflicts with militant French and Yankee Protestants, there were conflicts within the Catholic fold. By their insistence on remaining French, the Franco-Americans spoiled the Irish case that it was possible to be both Catholic and American. Both groups cherished a sneaking suspicion that the other was made up of poor Catholics. The ancient doctrine of *Gesta Dei per Francos* came into head-on collision with the equally ancient one that Irish Catholicism was the fine flowering of the Church. Among the Irish clergy there was a certain desire to keep in the saddle, and among the French a desire to strengthen their position. The troubles which arose at Fall River in 1884-1886, at Danielson in 1894-1896, and at North Brookfield in 1899 were outbreaks of a conflict which was latent almost everywhere in New England, but was brought to a head in these instances by personal factors.[99] All three incidents reflected a hardening of the French Canadians' desire for priests of their language and nationality, which had been noted from their first coming to New England, into an insistence upon it. It is possible to argue that all three incidents supplied evidence that the French Canadians put the preservation of their language above the preservation of their faith. But the French Canadians were not alone in believing that loss of their language meant loss of their faith; the Germans, Italians, Portuguese, and other new foreign-language Catholic groups shared this belief.[100]

The American hierarchy was divided in the 1880's and 1890's into two camps on the issue of territorial vs. "national" or foreign-language parishes. One group sought to hasten the assimilation of foreign Catholics as much as possible, so that differences of languages, traditions, and customs would disappear in a common American Catholi-

[98] Lord, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 126-129.

[99] Hamon, *op. cit.*, pp. 317-320; Magnan, *Notre Dame*, pp. 61-73; H. Dubuque, *Histoire et Statistique des Canado-Américains du Connecticut* (Worcester, 1899), pp. 32-54; M. Tetrault, *Le Role de la presse dans l'évolution du peuple franco-américaine de la Nouvelle-Angleterre* (Marseilles, 1935), pp. 101-105, 113-114; J. P. Tardivel, *La Situation religieuse aux Etats-Unis* (Montreal, 1900), p. 290-293.

[100] Lord, *op. cit.*, III, p. 165.

cism. The other group favored the conservation of language, traditions and customs in national parishes under priests of the same stock, while encouraging the development of patriotism to the adopted country. The former thought of national parishes as at best a temporary makeshift, while the latter considered them a necessity for at least a generation or two, lest the faith be renounced along with other ancestral traditions. Though Rome favored the national school by urging Bishop Thomas J. Hendricken to give the Franco-Americans of Fall River a priest of their nationality in 1885,[101] in 1887 it shifted to the other side when in response to German-American protests against the assimilative policies of Irish bishops and pastors, it directed that the national parish should be regarded as a temporary expedient.[102] The school of Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland remained dominant, and the Catholic Congress of Baltimore in 1889 stressed that "It must always be remembered that the Catholic Church recognizes neither north nor south nor east nor west nor race nor color." This resolution, adopted with reference to the German national societies—the congress held that "national societies, as such, have no place in the Church of this country; after the manner of this congress, they should be Catholic and American"—was violently protested by the Franco-American press.[103]

The Franco-Americans were undoubtedly supported and, perhaps, led in their struggle against assimilation by both lay and clerical leaders in Quebec, which was in a very hotheaded state at this period. Bishop de Goësbriand's old idea of the providential mission of the French Canadians to convert the United States was re-echoed by distinguished visitors from Canada, and sometimes given alarming political overtones. In 1889 Bishop Laflèche of Trois-Rivières, while on a visit to New England, told Father Biron of Springfield that he foresaw the annexation of part of the United States to Canada to form an independent French state. In clarifying his remark in the Montreal press Laflèche observed: "It is perhaps the design of Providence . . . the duty of French Canadians and Franco-Americans is to conform to it by jealously guarding their language and traditions."[104] This observation, which was echoed by the Franco-American press,

[101] Hamon, *op. cit.*, p. 320.
[102] Lord, *op. cit.*, III, p. 166.
[103] Hamon, *op. cit.*, pp. 87, 122-124.
[104] R. Rumilly, *Mgr. Laflèche et son temps* (Montreal, 1938), p. 294.

confirmed the worst suspicions of the nativists and led the Boston *British-American Citizen* to warn its readers that the "French Jesuits have conceived the project of forming a Catholic nation out of the Province of Quebec and New England, and this project of making New England French Catholic has already assumed proportions capable of alarming the most optimistic." Trembling Yankees did not need to fear the union of French and Irish to rule the country for the Pope which the *British-American* foretold, since any union for any purpose between them was highly unlikely.[105] But the extravagant statistics and verbal excesses of St. Jean Baptiste Day and national convention orators continued to disturb uneasy Yankees. The Boston *Herald* on June 25, 1891 viewed with alarm ex-Mayor Charles Thibault of Pawtucket's statement on the previous day that his compatriots constituted the "future rulers of the country."[106]

Though such Quebec political figures as Honoré Mercier and Senator François X. Trudel attended the national conventions and spoke at other Franco-American gatherings, it was the French-Canadian clergy, from prelate to humble missionary, who strove hardest to maintain the bond between the separated halves of their people. Bishop Racine and two other Quebec bishops prepared a *Mémoire sur la situation religieuse des Canadiens-Français aux Etats-Unis de l'Amérique du Nord* (Paris, 1892),[107] which was submitted to Cardinal Ledochowski, the new Prefect of the Propaganda. This document was seemingly designed to support the nomination of a French bishop to the vacant See of Ogdensburg, since it stressed the advisability of naming French Canadian bishops or at least vicars general in the dioceses where the French predominated.

But it also was a plea for the Franco-American parish, rehearsing Bishop de Goësbriand's arguments of 1869 and adding new ones as to the need of the Franco-Americans for clergy of their own stock. It noted that when priests unsympathetic to their traditions were placed over them, "they become discontented, insubordinate, uncontrollable; and their hearts are left open to the worst influences of heresy"; while when they were given priests of their own nationality, they made the faith flower. Bishop Racine argued that their language and customs were a useful dike, which should be built up rather than

[105] Hamon, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

[106] Amaron, *op. cit.*, p. vii.

[107] Reprinted in *Revue Franco-Américaine*, I (Quebec, 1908), pp. 482-488.

torn down, against Protestantism, indifferentism, atheism, materialism, public schools, and "the easy comfortable life or feverish pursuit of fortune which have lost thousands of souls to the Faith in the United States." Since the Holy Ghost had given the gift of tongues to the apostles and not to the nations, he argued that the priest should learn the language of the people, not the people that of the priest. English might be the language of the Church in the United States in the future, but there was no need to rush matters while half the Franco-Americans could not speak English and considerable immigration from Canada continued. Using Rameau de St. Père's observations on their birthrate, he argued that their rapid increase would soon make Catholicism dominant in several states, and that their loyalty to Rome would be of advantage. Making much of their profoundly Catholic spirit, their apostolic zeal, and their energetic effort to establish Catholic schools, he renewed his plea that they should have priests who knew their language and their customs and were sympathetic to their way of life. These priests should be French Canadians as far as possible, for "if the Canadians do not have priests of their own race at the head of their parishes, in the end defiance will be found among them; hence a source of endless trouble for ecclesiastical superiors and subordinates."

The merit of this last view was certainly borne out by the subsequent Danielson and Brookfield incidents in which Franco-Americans left the Church rather than remain under unsympathetic Irish pastors. But with the waning of the immigration and the rise of the American Protective Association, the views of the assimilative party in the American hierarchy prevailed at Rome. In a letter of April 26, 1896, to the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Francesco Satolli, who had shown little sympathy to the Danielson rebels,[108] Cardinal Ledochowski clarified the Propaganda's ruling of ten years earlier on national parishes by laying down the following principles:

1. Children born in America of foreign parents whose language is not English are not obliged, when coming of age, to become members of the parish of which their parents are part; but they have the right to enter a parish where the language of the country or English is used.

2. Catholics not born in America but who know English have the right to become members of the church in which English is used and cannot be

---

[108] Tetrault, *op. cit.*, pp. 103-104.

forced to submit to the jurisdiction of the pastor of the church established for the use of their nationality.[109]

The dream of a New Quebec in New England cherished by some extreme *patriotes,* was doomed by this attitude of Rome, by the end of large-scale immigration, and by the growing Americanism of the Franco-Americans, who were not content to be merely transplanted French Canadians and became increasingly integrated into American life.

At the turn of the century there were gloomy forebodings that the assimilative tide would sweep away the great network of Franco-American parishes built by the immigrants in the previous forty-odd years. The old French priests, often more Canadian than American-minded, took a dim view of *survivance* in the face of continued Irish opposition. Their attitude was probably accurately reflected in Father Onésime Triganne's interpretation of the prophecies of St. Malachy about the popes, when the question of a successor to Leo XIII was being discussed:

> *Ignis ardens,* that will be an Italian: the Italians are ardent and full of fire; *religio depopulata,* that will be an Irishman, the ruin of religion: there will be only holy water and the collection; *flos florum,* that will be a French Canadian, the flower of flowers.[110]

Jules-Paul Tardivel, who had been born in the United States but had returned to Canada to become the leading ultramontane journalist of Quebec, argued that assimilation and apostasy were virtually synonymous among the Franco-Americans, in refuting Brunetière's glowing picture in the *Revue de Deux Mondes* of American Catholicism.[111] Edmond de Nevers, a sociologically-minded Canadian historian, held that only faith and pride, "faith in the religion of their fathers, faith in the future of their race, pride in the French name," could save the Franco-Americans.[112]

This faith and pride have remained, though as de Nevers partially foresaw, the Franco-American has become distinct from the French Canadian. They have enabled the hundred-odd parishes of 1900 to

[109] Tardivel, *op. cit.,* p. 205, n. 7.

[110] H. Hamelin, *Notre-Dame-de-Sept Douleurs d'Adams, Massachusetts* (Montreal, 1916), pp. 227-228.

[111] Tardivel, *op. cit.,* p. 227.

[112] E. de Nevers, *L'Avenir du peuple canadien-français* (Paris, 1896), p. 116.

become 178 today.[113] The French parish has remained the bulwark of the Franco-American's remarkable resistance to complete cultural fusion in the American mass, while the Franco-American record in industry, government, and military service has refuted the nineteenth-century nativist's dire forebodings that the establishment of national parishes meant the end of the Republic. Frictions there have been, still are, and presumably will be in the future, but the Franco-American has become as typical of New England as the Yankee and the Irishman, and has notably enriched it religiously as well as otherwise.

Windsor, Vermont

[113] A. Robert, *L'Inviolabilité de la paroisse franco-américaine* (Manchester, 1948).

MISCELLANY

MATERIAL IN THE ARCHIVES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME RELATING TO THE AMERICAN MISSIONS IN THE FAR EAST

By

Boleslaw Szczesniak*

In the Archives of the University of Notre Dame, which are to a great extent ecclesiastical in character,[1] the present writer has found an interesting and heretofore unknown collection of materials relating to the American missions in the Far East, i.e., China, Japan, India, Korea, and the Philippine Islands. These Archives preserve papers of historical value connected with the large field of American activities ranging from immigration to North America, to home questions, relations with almost all of the other countries, administration of old parishes, mission houses, and dioceses in the United States, foreign Catholic missions, as well as to the missionaries in the Far East. The materials cover the period from 1600 to the present time and are being constantly augmented. The Archives are in the process of being catalogued by Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., Archivist and Head of the Department of History, to whom I am grateful for the permission to make this search.

The material which I have listed here is rather meager when compared with the whole collection of the Archives. It seemed, however, that for the benefit of the historians of American missions in the Far East it should be made known that many of these documents are of considerable value. They are included in the Hudson Papers, which were left by the late Daniel E. Hudson, C.S.C.,[2] one of the early scholars of the University of Notre Dame and popular personality in the field of the

* Mr. Szczesniak is assistant professor of Far Eastern history in the University of Notre Dame.

[1] Cf. Paul J. Foik, C.S.C., "Catholic Archives of America," *Catholic Historical Review,* I (April, 1915), 63-64. The collection of the Archives "has been the life work of the late James Farnham Edwards, who first conceived the idea of collecting in one place the documents and other priceless papers referring principally to the history of the Catholic Church in America" p. 63.

[2] Daniel E. Hudson, C.S.C. (1850-1934) : b. Nahant, Massachusetts, of Methodist parentage, he became a Catholic in his youth; educated at Notre Dame; joined the Holy Cross Fathers, 1870; edited *Ave Maria,* 1875-1930; died at Notre Dame. Cf. *The Guide to Catholic Literature, 1888-1940* (Detroit, 1940), p. 542; *American Catholic Who's Who,* I, 34-35; obituary, *Catholic World,* CXXXVIII (February, 1934), p. 623.

American Catholic press as the editor (1875-1930) of the *Ave Maria.*

Documents, letters, and papers left by Father Hudson are arranged chronologically in boxes and labelled as the Hudson Papers, and Miscellanea, Box 10. Here are found the unknown letters of Blessed Augustin Schoeffler, martyr in Tonkin, Indochina, and letters and papers of many missionary workers of American or foreign origin in their various capacities and ecclesiastical ranks. Here are also letters from humble and obscure nuns, priests, bishops, and vicars apostolic, as well as papers sent by native or foreign laymen who were interested in or connected with the missions. While some of the letters may appear at first glance to be unimportant, they are of real value as they are concerned with American missionary activities or with the help sent to many missions in the heathen countries by American Catholics. There are many papers pertaining to the biographies of various missionaries and the history of missions which are of importance insofar as they concern the establishment of the Catholic hierarchy in India, China, Japan, and Korea. Mention should likewise be made of letters and papers of exceptional interest relating to the revival of Catholicism in the Philippine Islands after the annexation by the United States, or to the restoration of ruined churches and monasteries by the American army during the Philippine War (1898-1901). American bishops working in the Philippines resorted to an appeal to public help to heal the wounds inflicted on the Spanish and native islanders. They also justly demanded payment by Congress for restoration and indemnification to the Philippines.

In the appreciation of the value and character of the papers it is important to realize that at the end of the nineteenth century and even in the beginning of the twentieth, the United States was itself in need of Catholic priests and workers in religious and educational fields. Even more remarkable is the value of the American effort in the establishment of early Asiatic missions, if we remember that at the same time many regions of this country were of missionary character, and that the realization of the Catholic educational institutions was decided as late as 1884 by the plenary council of Baltimore.[3]

Miscellanea (Box 10)

Manuscript letters (NNI-4) written by Blessed A. Schoeffler.[4] They are preserved in cloth sack of purple silk, 3 x 4 inches, with embroidered monogram V. S. A.

[3] Cf. Francis P. Cassidy, "Catholic Education in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore," *Catholic Historical Review,* XXXIV (October, 1948), pp. 257-305.

[4] Blessed Augustin Schoeffler of the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris, born, Mittelbronn, Lorraine, France, November 22, 1822; sent to do missionary

1) November 12, 1846, Séminaire des Missions Étrangères, to Louis Hoffer, a close friend of the Blessed.

Small 8-vo, 4 pp.

2) January 26, 1847, Paris, rue du Bac, 128, Séminaire des Missions Étrangères, to Madame Angelique.

Small 8-vo, 4 pp., last page blank.

3) September 8, 1847, Blamont, to Louis Hoffer.

Small 8-vo, 4 pp., last page blank.

4) May 24, 1848, Hong Kong, to Louis Hoffer, 20 pp. Page 1, title "Lettre de l'Abbé Schoeffler, Missionaire Apostolique au Ton King, à son ami Louis Hoffer. Le 24 Mai 1848; p. 2, blank; pp. 3-18 numbered by Blessed Schoeffler as pp. 1-16; signature on the p. 18 (16); pp. 19-20 blank.

Small 8-vo, pp. 20, last two blank and p. 2.

5) William H. Doyle, late superintendent of mills in Tokyo, Japan, and Shanghai, China; one-page printed note in reference to his prayers answered by the intercession of the Madonna of Lourdes, Our Lady of Lourdes, in Japan and China. Publication of the following note was refused by the editors of the *Evening Mercury*, Shanghai, China, March 17, 1885. There is mentioned also that "Rev. W. F. M. Garrett, for some years Incumbent of Christ Church at Yokohama, Japan, had been received into the Roman Catholic Church at Lourdes. . . ." The note was addressed and sent from Japan to Monsignor Osouf, Vicar Apostolic of Northern Japan, c/o *Ave Maria*, Notre Dame, Ind.

Roy. 8-vo, 2 pp., 1 p. blank.

6) Four pages of notes printed for the campaign for funds for Father L. X. Fernandes, Indian missionary, Rector of the Church of Our Lady of Assumption, Madras, India, with his photograph and the photograph of his "poor Indian orphans, all British subjects, appealing to your charity for building Orphanages for boys and girls . . .," also an extract from the *Catholic Missions* of Lyons of December 15, 1899, and the extracts of letters of recommendation from the apostolic nuncio in Vienna,[5] Cardinal

---

work in Tonkin, September 16, 1847; martyred, Son-Tay, Tonkin, May 1, 1851; beatified May 7, 1900, by Leo XIII. Cf. E. Mangenot, *Le Bienheureux Augustin Schoeffler* (Nancy, 1900). L'abbé Finot, *Un martyr lorrain en Extrême-Orient. Vie et mort du Bx. Augustin Schoeffler* (Metz, 1900).

[5] Emidio Taliani, titular Archbishop of Sebaste; Apostolic Nuncio in Vienna, 1896; Cardinal, 1903; born Montegallo, Italy, April 19, 1838; died Rome, 1907.

Richard of Paris,[6] Bishop Robert of the Archdiocese of Westminster,[7] and the Bishop of Birmingham,[8] all dated 1899-1900.

8-vo, 4 pp.

7) Collection of rare photographs and prints relating to Far Eastern activities of Catholic missions in the middle or second part of the nineteenth century.

a) Japanese Catholic priests at Nagasaki, Japan, a picture dedicated to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in the Archdiocese of Boston.
b) French Missionaries stationed at Nagasaki.
c) Interior of the Chapel of Nazareth in Nagasaki.
d) Two portraits of Eusebius Théophane Vénard,[9] missionary-martyr in Annam.
e) Three photographs of Tonkin soldiers of Vénard's time and the tomb of Tu Duc, Emperor of Annam, who condemned Théophane Vénard to death.

8) Eight photographs relating to the birthplace of Vénard in St. Loup, France, his presbytery in Assai, Dent Sèrves, France, and to the Reverend Prosper Delpech,[10] a former classmate of Théophane Vénard in Paris, Director of the Missions Étrangères.

9) One photograph (reprint) of Father H. Dorié,[11] missionary apostolic in Korea, "beheaded for the Faith in Corea, March 8, 1866."

10) Chateau Bretenières,[12] near Dijon, France, the home of Just de Bretenières, martyr in Korea.

[6] Franciscus Maria Beniaminus Richard, born Nantes, France, 1819; titular Archbishop of Larissa; Archbishop of Paris, 1886; cardinal, 1889.

[7] Robert Brindle, auxiliary Bishop of Westminster.

[8] Edward Ilsley, Bishop of Birmingham.

[9] Jean Théophane Vénard, Blessed, 1829-1861, member of the Foreign Society Mission (Missions Étrangères), martyred in Cochin-China on February 2, 1861. Beatified in 1909. Cf. James A. Walsh, *A Modern Martyr* (New York, 1913).

[10] For Prosper Delpech cf. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 96ff.

[11] Blessed Henry Dorié, friend and companion of Just de Bretenières, born September 23, 1839, Vendée, France; of Seminary of Foreign Missions as from 1862; martyred in Corea, at Son-Kol, on March 8, 1866, together with Bishop Berneux, Just de Bretenières, Louis Beaulieu. Cf. also: James Anthony Walsh, *Thoughts from Modern Martyrs* (Boston, 1906).

[12] Just de Bretenières (an abbreviated name of Simon Marie Antoine Just Ranfer de Bretenières) born, Châlon, France, February 28, 1838; came as a missionary (member of Foreign Missionary Society of Paris) to Corea 1864; martyred and beheaded in Corea on March 8, 1866, together with Bishop Berneux, Fathers Beaulieu and Dorié. Cf. John J. Dunn, *A Martyr of Our Own Day*, and Mgr. D'Hulot, *A Martyr of Our Own Times.*

11) Chinese Seminary of Theology in Canton, China.

12) A Philadelphia priest with his fellow-Catholics in Canton, China.

13) Three photos of Franciscan Missionaries of Mary dressing the lepers' sores, Rangoon, Burma.

14) Autograph inscription in Latin: "Evêché de Hakodate. Japan. A. Berlioz.[13] Beati qui habitant in domo tua!" Dated Notre Dame, Ind., 13 June, 1907.

8-vo, 4 pp. of which 3 pp. blank.

HUDSON PAPERS

XI-3—Hudson Papers, June 1 - December 31, 1885.

1) Letter dated Shanghai, China, July 14, 1884, to Hudson with information on the collection of Mexican Silver £37.00 for the "Floating chapel of Our Lady." The names of subscribers: Mrs. and Cpt. A. E. Knight, General J. Statsel, Mr. W. J. Allan, Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Doyle, Mr. J. J. Dunn, Mr. J. J. Raoul de Nully, Cpt. M. Howden, Miss M. E. Finnegan, M. Laurent Vander Stogen, Mr. Charles Bisson, M. G. de Bodin de Galankert, Mr. C. Bastiaen, Mr. Grochler.

8-vo, 2 pp. of which p. 2 blank.

Hudson Papers, May 1 - September 30, 1887.

1) Letter of 4 pp. from a French missionary in Singapore, dated August 28, 1887, to Hudson, ed. of *Ave Maria,* with request to insert announcement in his magazine for financial help for the missionary's needs. He says on page 2: "Que sont en effet 500, 1000 *pounds* pour ces riches dames d'Amérique . . . ?" The signature of the missionary, Father Joachim Meneuvrier, is legalized by the French Consulate in Singapore, Aug. 28, 1887, and signed by A. Villeroi, *le gérant du Consulat.*

8-vo, 4 pp.

Hudson Papers, April 1 - August 31, 1888.

1) Printed report in French on the state of missions in the Vicariate Apostolic of Northern Japan up to the date of August 15, 1888, and issued in Tokyo on the 21st of September, 1888, by Pierre Marie Osouf,[14] tit. Bishop of Arsinoe, Vicar Apostolic of Northern Japan.

8-vo, 4 pp.

[13] Alexander Berlioz, titular Bishop of Calinda, from April 24, 1891, missionary Bishop of Hakodate from June 15, 1891 (see Sendai), Japan, of the Foreign Mission Society of Paris; born Serrières, dioc. Chambéry, France, September 12, 1852.

[14] Petrus Maria Osouf, titular Bishop of Arsinoe, Vicar Apostolic of Northern Japan in Tokyo, Japan, from December 20, 1876; Archbishop of Tokyo from June 15, 1891, of the Society of Foreign Mission of Paris; born, Cerisy-LaSalle, Diocese of Contances, France, May 25, 1829.

Hudson Papers, September 1 - December 31, 1888.

1) Letter to Hudson, from the Archbishop of Calcutta, Mgr. Paul Goethals, S.J.,[15] dated September 1, 1888, Calcutta. Archbishop Goethals sends thanks for the *Ave Maria,* etc.
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 2 pp. are written.

2) Holograph letter from Mgr. "Eduard Gasnier,[16] Bishop of Eucarpia, Vicarius Apost. of Malay Peninsula," dated Singapore, September 4, 1888, to Hudson with thanks for the *Ave Maria.*
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 2 pp. blank.

3) Letter in French from Mgr. P. M. Osouf, Vicar. Apost., dated Tokyo, September 22, 1888. The bishop sends thanks for the letter of Hudson, recalling his memories of his sojourn at Notre Dame, and referring to his works and recent pastoral visitations in Northern Japan, 300 miles from Tokyo. He also attaches "une petite statistique de l'état actuel de la Mission, . . . résumé de l'administration depuis Août, '87 à Août, '88 . . ."
8-vo, 4 pp.

4) Letter from Bishop Ch. A. Bourdon,[17] dated Hong Kong, October 17, 1888, with thanks to Hudson ". . . Owing to indifferent health I have left Mandalay and live now in Hong Kong."
8-vo, 4 pp. of which 2 pp. blank.

5) Letter from Bishop of Kishnaghar, Mgr. Francis Pozzi,[18] dated Kishnaghar, November 27, 1888, with complimentary thanks for a letter and papers.
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 2 pp. blank.

[15] Paul Goethals, S.J., titular Bishop of Evarcia from December 3, 1877, Archbishop of Hierapolis from February 3, 1878, Metropolitan of Calcutta, India, November 25, 1886; born Courtrai, Diocese of Bruges, Belgium, November 11, 1832; died, Calcutta, July 4, 1904.

[16] Edward Gasnier, the first Bishop of Malacca, elected February 2, 1878, as Bishop of Eucarpia and Vicar Apostolic of Malayan Peninsula. Nominated Bishop of Malacca August 10, 1888; died, Singapore, April 8, 1896.

[17] Carolus Aresnius Bourdon, Bishop of Dardan from 1872, late Vicar Apostolic of Mandalay, Burma, auxiliary Bishop of Malacca residing in Singapore, of the Society Mission of Paris; born, Coligni, Diocese of Séez, France, May 1, 1834.

[18] Francesco Pozzi, Bishop of Kishnaghar or Krishnâgar, Central Bengal from November 25, 1886; previously he was Vicar Apostolic of Hyderabad from August, 1870; of the Foreign Mission of Milano; born, Milano, Italy, March 25, 1828; died, Krishnâgar, October 22, 1905.

Hudson Papers, January - June, 1890.

1) Letter from Mgr. Leonard Mellano, O.C.D.,[19] Archbishop of Verapoly near Cochin, East "India." The archbishop mentions Mgr. Berardi, his coadjutor, and Mgr. Montagnini, secretary to the Apostolic Delegate to India at Ootacamund(?).
4-to, 4 pp., of which 2 pp. blank.

2) Letter from V. J. Bentens, a resident in Penang, dated May 12, 1890, asking for permission to reprint an article from *Ave Maria* in Penang paper, *Straits Independent*.
4-to, 4 pp., of which 2 pp. blank.

X-3—Hudson Papers, July 1 - December 31, 1890.

1) Letter in French from P. M. Osouf, Vicar Apostolic of Northern Japan, to Hudson, thanking him for £163.8.4, which he received in the Yokohama Bank from the United States. The bishop mentions his plans to travel to Europe and his "nouvelle visite aux Etats-Unis."
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 1 blank.

X-3—Hudson Papers, January 1 - December 31, 1891.

1) Letter from Mgr. Leonard Mellano, O.C.D., Archbishop of Verapoly near Cochin, Malabar Coast, not dated, with thanks for the magazine.
4-to, 2 pp., of which 1 p. blank.

2) Letter in French from Mgr. P. M. Osouf, dated Tokyo, January 26, 1891, with thanks for the additional help of £639.3.0 for his missionary work in Japan. He mentions Father Gillonde[20] Lowell who was to go to the United States from Japan, and a Father Berger, who died of influenza.
8-vo, 4 pp.

3) Letter in French from G. Testevuide,[21] a missionary near the Vicariate Apostolic, Tokyo, dated January 26, 1891, who sends thanks also for the financial help sent to the vicar apostolic, of which he hopes to get a portion for the Yokohama mission house, and also for the "deux belles images que vous m'avez destinées."
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 1 p. blank.

[19] Leonardus Mellano, O.C.D., titular Bishop of Olimpio from 1868, titular Archbishop of Nicomedia from June 15, 1870, and Metropolitan of Indostan in Verapoly, India; born Carucco, Diocese of Mondovi, Italy, January 26, 1826; died, Verapoly, August 19, 1897.

[20] Cf. *La religion de Jésus*, II, 374ff.

[21] Cf. *La religion de Jésus*, II, 374ff; p. 566; died, Hong-Kong, August 3, 1891.

4) Letter in French from Mgr. P. M. Osouf, dated Tokyo, August 19, 1891, with thanks for the "belle collection des livres" sent him by Hudson. He mentions that the Protestant "journal de Yokohama" was sympathetic in its article toward his patronage of a hospital.

5) Letter in French from Mgr. P. M. Osouf, dated Tokyo, September 16, 1891, with thanks for the books received for the convent in Tokyo. He sends thanks in the name of "Madame Supériéure." He explains that part of his vicariate territory was ceded to the new Vicariate of Hakodate, which had recently been established. He is of the opinion that there is a possibility of effective work in the conversion of all Japan, but the Protestant missionaries and Russians are an obstacle.
8-vo, 4 pp.

6) Letter in French from Mgr. P. M. Osouf, with thanks for further financial help for the leper hospital in Japan which was under the supervision of Catholic nuns. He also explains that the Pope established in Japan a Catholic hierarchy with episcopal sees in Tokyo, Nagasaki, Osaka and Hakodate. "Tokio est érigé un Archevêché." He was appointed as the first Archbishop of Tokyo[22] and signed the letter accordingly. The letter is dated, "Tokio, le 16 Nov. 91."
8-vo, 4 pp.

7) Letter in French from P. Vigrouse, a missionary, with thanks for the addresses of American and Mexican newspapers to which he is going to write, dated Tokyo, December 10, 1891.
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 2 pp. blank.

Hudson Papers, 1892-1893.

1) Letter in French from P. Vigrouse of the Apostolic Vicariate in Tokyo, dated May 22, 1892. A complimentary letter, "Mgr. Osouf va bien S. G. vous presente ses respectueuses amitiés."

2) Letter in French from P. Vigrouse of the Apostolic Vicariate in Tokyo, dated February, 1892, to Hudson, thanking him for the £66 toward the maintenance of the leper house in the Kusatsu village in Nagana. About sixty lepers were in the house, many of them Christians.
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 1 blank.

3) Letter from Henry J. Quinn, S.J., a teacher of English at St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, India, dated October 6, 1893.

[22] Cf. *La religion de Jésus*, II, 538ff., P. M. Osouf, Archbishop of Tokyo; J. A. Cousin, Bishop of Nagasaki; Midon, Bishop of Osaka; A. Berlioz, Bishop of Hakodate.

Hudson is asked for permission to reprint some stories from the *Ave Maria* for the English textbooks of Indian pupils.
Small 8-vo, 4 pp., of which 1 blank.

Hudson Papers, 1894-1896.

1) Letter in French from Archbishop Osouf in Tokyo, dated January 20, 1894, with thanks for the £31 sent him for the leper house in Kusatsu. This amount was equivalent to Japanese yen 56.88. He says that he has just received from Rome approved "les *acta et decreta* de notre modeste synode de Nagasaki."[23]
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 1 blank.

2) Letter of Bishop P. J. Hurth[24] of Dacca, East Bengal, India, March 3, 1895, to Hudson, thanking him for the hospitality extended to him during his three-day stay. Hurth recollects his opinion about the social situation in Bengal. He says also that the "yearly revenue of the diocese of Dacca (all alms) hardly exceeds £6000. From this, fourteen priests and the Bishop and a brother manage to live . . ."
8-vo, 4 pp.

3) A complimentary letter from Bishop of Lahore (India), Mgr. G. Pelckman, O.F.M.,[25] to Hudson, dated Lahore, May 10, 1896.
4-to, 4 pp., of which 1 blank.

[23] The First Provincial Council of the bishops of Japan, March 19, 1890, Nagasaki, held at the tomb of Mons. Bernard T. Petitjean (1829-1884), Vicar Apostolic of Japan, a Frenchman, the founder of the modern Catholic Church of Japan. The council coincided in date with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the discovery of the Japanese Christians (in Nagasaki and in the vicinity), the descendants of those converted by the Jesuits in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This event took place on March 19, 1865, in the time when the old persecuting edicts of extreme severity against Christianity were still in force. Adrien Launay, *Nos Missionaries,* pp. 115-134.

[24] Peter Joseph Hurth, C.S.C., Bishop of Dacca (1894-1909); Eleutherna (1909-1912); Nueva Segovia (1912-1926); Archbishop of Bostra (1926-1935); born, Nittel-on-Moselle, Diocese of Treves, Rhine Province, Germany, March 30, 1857; died, Manila, Philippine Islands, August 1, 1935; buried, Vigan, Neuva Segovia, Philippine Islands. Educated at the University of Notre Dame. Rector of St. Joseph's College, Cincinnati, Ohio (1880-1883); rector of St. Edward's College, Austin, Texas (1884-1894), consecrated September 16, 1894, Notre Dame.

[25] Goffredus Pelckman, O.F.M., Cap., Bishop of Lahore, resident Agra, India, from June 2, 1893; born Turnho, Archdiocese of Malines, Belgium, January 16, 1854.

4) Letter from Bishop Hurth of Dacca, East Bengal, dated October 12, 1896. Among many interesting remarks he writes: "I am afraid that Catholics living in large and wealthy congregations or parishes are not kept mindful of the missionary . . ."
8-vo, 6 pp., of which 1 blank.

Hudson Papers, 1897-1898.

1) Letter from M. Donsen, Catholic Chaplain, Rawulpindi, British India, dated February 16, 1897, with the appeal for missionary help.
12-mo., 4 pp., of which 1 blank.

2) Letter from Bishop Hurth, Dabēāl Dacca, March 1, 1897. The apostolic vicar conveys his interesting observations relating to Bengal.
4-to, 4 pp., one blank.

3) Letter from Bishop Hurth, dated July 18, 1897, with many interesting remarks ". . . The work that has to be done now must chiefly be done by Hindoos and Mussulmans. They are far from experts, but thieves every one of them . . ."
8-vo, 8 pp., of which 3 blank.

4) Letter from Sister Xavier Berkeley (Sister of Charity), dated Ningpo, China, September 1, 1897, to Hudson, asking for financial help for her mission. She also sends a booklet written by the vicar apostolic, Mgr. Reynard, and writes on the Protestants' destructive competition in missionary work in China.
8-vo, 4 pp.

5) Letter from Bishop Hurth, dated, Dacca, November 16, 1897, describing destruction and misery caused by a cyclone in Chittagong, India.
4-to, 4 pp., of which 1 blank, and attached newspaper cutting.

6) Letter from Mother Superior Joseph, of St. Joseph's Convent, Nagpur, Central Provinces, India, dated November 23, 1897, to the editor of the *Ave Maria*, with thanks for the cheques of £115.–.–. The missionary describes conditions of work in her district, poverty of populace, etc.
8-vo, 6 pp.

7) Letter from Mother Superior Joseph, of St. Joseph's Convent, Nagpur, India, dated January 16, 1898, to Hudson, describing in detail conditions of work, people living in the convent's vicinity, casts, etc.
8-vo, 10 pp.

8) Letter of the same Sister Joseph of St. Joseph's Convent, Nagpur, India, dated May 13, 1898, with thanks for the financial assistance

received and with information on missionary work. To the letter is attached a page of Nagpur and Berar *Times* of Saturday, December 11, 1897, in which is a detailed description of an entertainment given by the convent.
8-vo, 4 pp.

9) Letter of the same Sister Joseph of Nagpur, dated May 15, (1897?), with thanks for "contributions" and information as to their use.
8-vo, 8 pp., of which 1 blank.

10) Letter from the same Sister Joseph of Nagpur, dated January 29, 1898(?), thanking Hudson for donations and informing him on the life and work of her mission.
8-vo, 8 pp., of which 1 blank.

11) Printed report in French: "État de la Mission de Tokio (Partie de l'ancien Vicariat du Japan Septentrional)" as of August 1, 1898 (from August 1, 1897). Population in the mission district: 1,409,500, of which 8,669 are Japanese Catholics, and 445 Western Catholics. Personnel of the mission: one archbishop (Pierre-Marie Osouf), thirty-four missionaries from Europe, two Japanese priests, six seminarians, twenty-five catechists, Sisters of St. Paul de Chartres, of St. Maur, forty-four churches and chapels, . . . The following districts belonged to the missions: Tokyo, Yokohama, Chiba, Mito, Utsunomiya, Hachioji, Shizuoka, Nagoya, Kofu, Matsumoto, Kanasawa.
8-vo, 4 pp.

13) Letter from Sister Joseph, superior of St. Joseph's Convent, Nagpur, Central Provinces, India, dated November 10, 1898, with thanks for money and additional description of her mission's activities, and the use made of monetary help.
8-vo, 8 pp.

14) Letter in French from Archbishop Osouf of Tokyo, dated November 27, 1898, to Hudson, with thanks for his assistance, and with information on his missions in Japan, and especially in the Gotemba district.
8-vo, 4 pp.

X-4—Hudson Papers, 1899-1900.

1) Letter from Sister Joseph of St. Joseph's Convent, Nagpur, India, dated January 20, 1899, sending thanks for the cheque of £13.14.3, and explaining about the convent's works and activities.
8-vo, 4 pp.

2) Letter in French from Archbishop Osouf of Tokyo, dated February 2, 1899, sending thanks for £29.9.5, and explaining about preaching conditions in Japan.
8-vo, 4 pp.

3) Letter from the same Sister Joseph, dated May 2, 1899, describing interesting happenings among the Hindu people and Catholic missions. About the crucifiers of Jesus, she mentions the indignation of the natives, who said: "We shall keep company with Jesus in place of those wicked Jews."
4-to, 4 pp.

4) Letter in Latin from J. M. Corre in Kumamoto, Japan, dated June 30, 1899, sending thanks for his help and informing him about the missionary work among the lepers in Nagano prefecture: "Opus inceptus est in tribus sequentibus locis: Biwasaki, Kumamoto et Yatsushiro . . . Anno vero ultime praeterito 1898, recepimus moniales Franciscanas ad curandum infirmos . . . , etc." Attached photograph of Japanese lepers and Franciscan nuns washing them.
Small 8-vo, 4 pp.

5) Letter from Mr. Francis McCullagh, an Irishman, employed by the *Japan Times*, Tokyo, dated January 18, 1900. "I came here with good prospects . . . but on account of a disagreement with the English colony here on Boer War I find that the chance of my succeeding is slight . . ."
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 2 blank.

6) Letter in French from A. Berlioz, Bishop of Hakodate, Japan, dated April 21, 1908, in Sendai (North Japan). In the letter is a transliteration of Japanese law restricting Christianity and recalling its unlawful existence in Japan, also a Latin translation of it by Mgr. A. Berlioz: "Decretum stricte servetur *quae usque modo* viguit Christianae sectae prohibitio—Proscripta omnino remaneat illa perversa secta. Mense tertio anni quarti, Erae Kei-ō (1868). Mense Martio, Tribunale Supremum."
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 1 blank.

7) Letter from Bishop of Nagpur, India, Mgr. Charles F. Pelvat,[26] dated May 10, 1900, to Hudson. A very cordial and pleasant letter: "When after many years more of fruitful and holy work, you will enter into heaven, you will be most lovingly greeted by our blessed Lady . . ."
4-to, 4 pp.

[26] Carolus Felix Pelvat of the Society of Salesian Fathers, Bishop of Nagpur, India, from October 2, 1893; born, 1845, France, died, Nagpur, July 23, 1900.

8) Letter from Bishop Pelvat, dated June 7, 1900, thanking Hudson for the monetary help which he so needs for his missionaries and for various activities.
12-mo, 8 pp., of which 2 blank.

9) Letter from Sister Joseph, superioress of St. Joseph's Convent, Nagpur, Central Provinces, India, dated July 25, 1900(?), describing in detail again her mission's work and sending thanks for the help received from Hudson. She also mentions Bishop Pelvat.
8-vo, 4 pp.

10) Letter from the same Sister Joseph, describing many difficulties in her mission's district owing to the Presbyterian mission and other Protestant missionaries coming to the neighboring natives.
8-vo, 10 pp.

11) Letter from J. X. Schouppa, S.J., dated October 15, 1900, Bengal British India, St. Mary's Kurseong (Seminary) with his pamphlet on the knowledge of "sublime and consoling truths of Revelation . . ."
16-mo., 4 pp., of which 2 blank.

12) Letter of Chinese Legation, Washington, December 26, 1900, referring to "address, I said 'some' missionaries were crying for vengeance . . ."
4-to, 2 pp., second blank.

Hudson Papers, 1901-1903.

1) Letter from Francis McCullagh of the *Japan Times*, Tokyo, January 15, 1901, to Hudson concerning his contributions from Japan to *Ave Maria*. "I am sure you will sympathize with a Catholic in a place like Tokyo where the second-hand book stores are filled with Huxleys and Spencers but where not even the Imperial Library contains a single Catholic (religious), not even one volume of Newman!"
8-vo., 4 pp., of which 2 pp. blank.

2) Letter from A. M. Benziger,[27] Bishop of Tabe, dated: Guilon, Malabar Coast, India, May 17, 1901, to Hudson. A complimentary letter.
4-to, 4 pp., 3 blank.

3) Letter from Mgr. Crochet, O.P.,[28] apostolic administrator, dated

[27] Ludovicus Maria Benziger, O.C.D., titular Bishop of Tabe (or Tabae) or Davis, Coadjutor Bishop of Guilon (or Quilon), C.F.S., Malabar Coast, India, from July 17, 1900; born, Bruxelles, Belgium, January 3, 1863.

[28] Joannes Maria Crochet of the Salesian Society of Annecy; Bishop of Nagpur from November 28, 1900; born, Annecy, France, March 27, 1844; died Jubbulpur, June 6, 1903.

October 26, 1901, Nagpore, India, to Hudson, thanking for the cheque of £23.–. He says about conversions made by the sister catechists and Sisters of St. Joseph, "With some few pieces of money and some medicine these good nuns can visit the families . . ."
12-mo, 6 pp.

4) Letter from R. M. Lobo, Fajir, Farangipet, India, dated June 17, 1902. Among many remarks on Protestant missionaries, he says: "The Lutherans owning extensive landed properties here, have succeeded in perverting some of their Catholic tenants . . . A wily heathen landlord owning some property close to his church, has, *per fas et nefas,* and more *per nefas,* succeeded in securing some acres of ground once in the enjoyment of this church . . ."
8-vo, 4 pp.

5) Letter from S. Vas, "R. C. Priest," St. Joseph's Seminary, Mangalore, India, dated September 1, 1902, with interesting remarks on priests' life and difficult conditions of missionary work.
8-vo, 4 pp.

6) Letter from Anthony Kachapully, Vicar of Palayur Church, East India, Malabar, expressing thanks for help received and asking more for the needs of the mission.
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 2 blank.

7) Letter from R. M. Lobo, Fajir, Farangipet, British India, dated March 25, 1903, to Hudson, thanking him for $50. "I have to tell you something *entre nous.* Some of the members (S.J.) here take ill when the indigenous clergy take up their pen and write to their Catholic brethren across the seas for help. The sea-coast towns of Mangalore, Cannanore, Calicut are occupied by them, whereas the interior rural places are assigned to the indigenous clergy. The reports which some of them send to their *Nostri* are so florid that a stranger must be stupefied . . ."
12-mo, 4 pp.

8) Letter of Arthur Lloyd, Tokyo, dated April 8, 1903, concerning open letters published in the *Ave Maria,* ". . . as I am not unnaturally being attacked . . ."
12-mo, 4 pp., of which 3 blank.

9) Letter in French from Archbishop Osouf of Tokyo, dated April 14, 1903, concerning a recommendation given to Brother Albani, about the lepers of Japan, new baptisms, etc.
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 1 blank.

10) Letter from Bishop M. Crochet, Vicar Apostolic of Nagpore, dated June 2, 1903, in Jubbulpore, India. "In my vast Diocese (17 mil-

lions) we are still in the period of the quiet possession of the Devil . . ."
12-mo, 4 pp.

11) Letter from Mr. Dunalal Bulchand, of Hyderabad, Sind, India, dated November 11, 1903, asking Hudson for information on religious books.
12-mo, 4 pp., one blank.

12) Letter in French from Archbishop Osouf of Tokyo, with thanks for the help given the seventy-five lepers of Gotemba in Japan.
8-vo, 4 pp.

13) Letter from B. Cothonar, O.P., curate of Haiphong, Tonkin, Indo-China, dated December 12, 1903, concerning Bishop M. Fernandez of Tonkin, and containing complimentary remarks. "I am so fond of everything American, for I was for five or six years missionary in your dear big country . . . I was the founder of Sherman Park Convent."
8-vo, 4 pp.

X-4—Hudson Papers, 1904-1906.

1) Letter from J. G. Hertweck, Los Banos, P. I. An interesting report on the Philippine Islands and Catholicism, dated December 6, 1904. "The Filipino Priest is surprised at the change come over his People since the Spanish occupation changed into the American ways of Preaching the Gospel . . . Schisms have sprung up of which he never heard. False teachers have multiplied of which he previously knew nothing . . . The Friars' Organ 'Libertas' said the bringing of the Statute of Antipola to Manila was to impress the Americano and increase his respect to Filipino Womanhood . . . The Churches and Convents racked by neglect and our vandal Soldiery, who spent so much of their time driving nails and knocking away plaster in the previously beautiful Conventual Buildings . . ."
8-vo, 4 pp.

2) Letter in French from Archbishop Osouf, Tokyo, dated January 10, 1905, expressing thanks for the check for the lepers in Gotemba, Japan.
12-mo, 4 pp. 1 blank.

3) Letter from the Reverend Antony Goveas of St. John's Leper Asylum, Mandalay, Burma, dated March 18, 1905. Remarks on eighteen kinds of leprosy and treatment.
Small 8-vo, 4 pp.

4) Letter from the same A. Goveas, who was infected with leprosy, dated May 14, 1905. "My affected parts turn more purplish . . .

Nobody who sees me will be able to say that I suffer from leprosy . . ."
12-mo, 4 pp.

5) Letter of the above missionary, dated August 20, 1905, with interesting remarks and information on lepers, population of the district, conditions of work, etc.[29]
12-mo, 8 pp.

6) Letter from Arthur Lloyd, Tokyo, dated October 20, 1905, refers to ". . . my book, which is being read now as a text-book in a Buddhist Seminary . . ."
8-vo, 2 pp.

7) Letter from Fathers Philip M. Finegan, S.J., and James P. Monaghan, S.J., dated Manila, P. I., November 23, 1905, requesting funds. Signers of the letter wrote, "at the request of his Grace, the Most Rev. J. J. Harty . . ."
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 1 blank.

8) Letter of Father Goveas, St. John's Asylum for lepers, Mandalay, Burma, dated November 26, 1905, with thanks and additional remarks on his health, ". . . no improvement perceptible, except that my right ankle, which would not crack since the beginning of the exterior appearance of the disease (1903), now occasionally cracks."
8-vo, 4 pp., 1 of which blank.

9) Letter from Wilfrid M. Hallam, O.F.M., dated February 9, 1906, St. Joseph's, Weihaiwei, China, to Hudson, thanking him for £10:4:1.
12-mo, 4 pp., of which 2 blank.

10) Copy of the typed letter of the Apostolic Delegate in Manila, Archbishop A. Ambrose Agius, O.S.B.,[30] dated Manila, P. I., April 19, 1906, to the Reverend J. Freri,[31] General Director, S.P.F., in New York. The delegate sends information on the Philippine

[29] St. John's Leper Asylum, Mandalay, Northern Burma, where Father Antony F. Goveas stayed. He was under the care of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary.

[30] Ambrosius Agius, O.S.B., titular Archbishop of Palmira, Apostolic Delegate to the Philippine Islands, appointed August 28, 1904; born, September 17, 1856.

[31] Joseph Freri, Bishop of Constantia (1924-1927); born, St. Etienne, France, February, 1864. Engaged in educational and missionary work in the United States, 1888-1924; died St. Etienne, France, October 30, 1927. Author of the *Native Clergy for Mission Countries*, two pamphlets (New York, 1917) published by the Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

bishops' requests for priests. Bishop Hendrick[32] of Cebu, Archbishop Ireland,[33] Bishop Rooker[34] of Jaro, Bishop Dougherty[35] of Nuova Segovia, Mr. James J. Hill, Marquis de Commillas and a Father Finnegan are mentioned.
4-to, 8 pp., of which 4 blank.

11) Letter of the Apostolic Delegate in Manila, P. I., Archbishop A. Ambrose Agius, dated April 20, 1906: ". . . I have no doubt as to the generosity of the American people once their interest is aroused in a good cause. I have had many proofs in the past . . ."
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 2 blank.

12) Letter from Mr. Arthur Lloyd, Tokyo, April 20, 1906, with an explanation about Amida Buddha.
8-vo, 10 pp., of which 5 blank.

13) Letter from the Reverend Anthony Goveas, Mandalay, April 22, 1906, with thanks for £6:7:7, to his "good benefactor." "The Doctor from Paris sent a pamphlet . . . among other things he proves poisonous matters found in the urine of lepers."
8-vo, 4 pp.

14) Letter of the same A. Goveas, April 29, 1906, explaining how the native physician treats leprosy.
8-vo, 4 pp.

15) Letter from Wilfried M. Hallam, O.F.M., St. Joseph's, Weihaiwei, North China, dated June 24, 1906, with thanks for help and giving information on his Chinese mission.
8-vo, 4 pp.

16) Letter from the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Agius, dated Manila, July 20, 1906. "Let me tell you, dear Father, that the

[32] Thomas Augustine Hendrick, Bishop of Cebu, born, Penn Yan, New York, October 29, 1849; died, Manila, Philippine Islands, November 29, 1909; buried Manila. Educated in the United States, engaged in pastoral work in the Diocese of Rochester (1873-1903). Consecrated, August 23, 1903, Rome, by Francis Cardinal Satolli.

[33] John Ireland, Bishop of Maronea (1875-1884); St. Paul (1884-1888); Archbishop St. Paul (1888-1918). Born, Burnchurch, County Kilkenny, Ireland, September 11, 1838; died, St. Paul, September 25, 1918, buried, St. Paul. Represented Bishop Thomas Langdon Grace, O.P., of St. Paul, at the Vatican Council (1869-1870), consecrated, December 21, 1875.

[34] Frederick (*alias* Francis) Tadok Rooker, First American bishop in the Philippine Islands, Diocese of Jaro, appointed June 14, 1903; born, New York City, September 19, 1861; died September 20, 1907.

[35] Dennis Joseph Dougherty, born August 16, 1865, Honesville, Pennsylvania, Bishop of Nueva Segovia (1903-1908); Jaro (1908-1915); Buffalo (1915-1918); Archbishop of Philadelphia (1918-); Cardinal, 1921.

devil is very busy in the Philippines, scandalous and irresponsible talk is the order of the day. Never could I wish to see a holier, more zealous set of men than those who adorn the Hierarchy of the Philippines, and yet maliciously false reports are spread about, broadcast, and scandal is rife. I know one army officer now in the U. S. who would be wiser if he held his tongue . . ." He mentions also in the letter the name of the first native bishop, Mgr. Barlin.[36]

8-vo, 4 pp., of which 2 blank.

17) Letter from the same Archbishop Agius, about the places allotted in American seminaries for the Filipino theological students. He mentions the names of Bishops McQuaid and Hendrick and Mr. Hearn.

4-to, 4 pp., of which 2 blank.

18) Letter from W. Micholitz, dated Singapore, September 16, 1906, criticizing *Ave Maria's* article on Philippine Islands. "A certain missionary of the A.(merican) B.(aptist) Mission, a medical man, wanted to go home on leave, partly because . . . his pockets were well lined, and also because some high British Gov't. official had given him a hint, because he had been selling fire arms and ammunition to the natives on a rather large scale." He reports on many scandalous cases of Protestant missionaries in Singapore and Malaya.

8-vo, 12 pp.

19) Letter from Archbishop Agius, dated Manila, November 17, 1906. "I have not written to Mons. Falconio, urging an appeal for a creation of a Philippino fund; I have done something better by asking His Em., the Card. Secretary of State, to communicate with the Delegate in Washington if he thinks fit. This is more in keeping with my mode of operation and the results will be more effective . . . The American press here is vile and Abp. Harty has been most cowardly attacked during his absence . . . The Government is delaying the payment of our claims for damages and rent during the war . . ."

8-vo, 4 pp.

20) Letter from Archbishop Hurth, dated December 24, 1906, on the Ganges. "I am again floating on the above named stream in anticipation of reaching the Dacca railroad . . ." A very interesting letter referring to his stay in Rome, voyage to India, plague in Bengal, etc. "When I left for Europe a student of the Dacca

[36] Jorge Barlin, Bishop of Nueva Caceres, Philippine Islands, from 1906; born Philippine Islands; died, Rome, September 5, 1909.

Govt. College, 18 yrs. son of a Rai Bahadur (titled landlord) idol of his father, and singularly attached to me, although a Hindoo, a beautiful and intelligent youth, wanted by all means to travel with me . . . The fourth day after my departure the young man was seized by cholera and in two hours he was a corpse. That is the real Asiatic cholera . . ."
4-to, 4 pp.

21) Letter from Bishop H. M. Bottero,[37] dated Kumbakonam, December 25, 1906, to Hudson, thanking him for help received.

22) Letter from Sister Xavier, dated Ningpo, China, December 26, 1905, describing missionary work among Chinese children.
8-vo, 4 pp.

Hudson Papers, 1907-1908.

1) Letter from Archbishop Agius, Manila, dated January 1, 1907, with information about his efforts to work out educational facilities for "Ecclesiastical Students," and asking Hudson to propagate the idea through the *Ave Maria*. Also many remarks concerning the plans in this respect, and mentioning an offer of Bishop McQuaid[38] as "the only one up to date."
8-vo, 6 pp., of which 3 blank.

2) Letter from the same, dated March 22, 1907, Manila. He gives thanks for securing forty-two places for Filipinos in American seminaries. Among many interesting remarks, he says: "It makes me shed tears of blood to see the progress the Protestants are making in these Islands. If American Protestants can show so much zeal in robbing us from our people, surely our Catholic friends should come to our help in preserving the Faith . . ."
8-vo, 4 pp.

3) Letter from Mr. Arthur Lloyd, Tokyo, dated April 8, 1907. Among his[39] remarks on his interest in the early Christianity of China, he mentions also "first Englishman in India was a Jesuit Father—Thomas Stephens—expelled from New College Oxford at the

[37] Hugo Magdalena Bottero, first Bishop of Kumbakonam, India, appointed September 5, 1899; born, Chambéry, France, January 20, 1837; died Kumbakonam, May 21, 1913.

[38] Bernard Joseph John McQuaid, Bishop of Rochester (1868-1909), born New York, December 15, 1823, died, Rochester, January 18, 1909; buried, Rochester.

[39] The Reverend A. Lloyd, came to Japan as an Anglican missionary from England in 1884, where he was also interested in the study of Japanese Buddhism. As the result of his studies he published *The Wheat among the Tares. Studies of Buddhism in Japan* (London, 1908). He was also a lecturer at the Imperial University, Naval Academy, and Commercial College, Tokyo.

accession of Queen Elizabeth. He published in 1584 in Portuguese and Sanscrit a Catechism, entitled *Doctrina Christiana.* Curiously enough the Jesuits in Japan published in Japanese a Catechism bearing the name, which appeared in 1600. I am trying now to discover if these two Catechisms are the same." (The two works were not the same.)
4-to, 2 pp.

4) Letter from Francis Xavier Hsieh de Marie, a Chinese officer in the magistrate's office, Weihaiwei. It contains interesting information about his conversion and contacts with Wilfrid Hallam, O.F.M. He wished to "spread our Blessed Lady's glories in the Celestial Empire and to cause her to be known and honoured in place of a Chinese goddess who bears a title due our Divine Mother only, 'Holy Mother Queen of Heaven' . . ."
4-to, 6 pp., of which 3 blank.

5) Letter from Bishop of Cebu, Thomas A. Hendrick, dated May 31, 1907. An interesting letter on the Filipino Church. "The Catholic Church in the Philippines is laboring under the greatest difficulties, from the results of war, famine, epidemics, the active and intelligent warfare of atheists, and of their allies the Protestant missionaries . . ."
4-to, 4 pp., of which 2 blank.

6) Letter in French from Mgr. P. Ferrant, C.M., Vicar Apostolic of Kiu-Kiang, China, dated June 17, 1907, with information about "difficulties" in China, and asking "livres bien utiles pour nos quelques catholiques de langue anglaise . . ."
12-mo, 4 pp.

7) Letter in French from the Reverend J. Bertrand, Leprosy of Gotemba, Japan, dated July 27, 1907, asking for help and sending him "Tableau des recettes et des dépenses de la Léproserie de Gotemba pendant l'année 1906."
12-mo, 4 pp., of which 1 blank.

8) Letter in French of the same missionary, dated August 1, 1907, sending thanks for the $43.50, and explaining that he already has received "a great help" from Hudson in the amount of $614.78.
12-mo, 4 pp., of which 1 blank.

9) Letter in French of the same, dated December 17, 1907, to Hudson, thanking him for help.
12-mo, 2 pp.

10) Three photographs and two cards from Weihaiwei, sent by F. X. Hsieh, non-dated, probably from the beginning of 1908.

11) Letter in French from A. Berlioz, Bishop of Hakodate, Japan, dated April 10, 1908, sending a copy of an edict in Japanese "pour

le musée de N. D." prohibiting Christianity in 1868. He says also: "Les Dames du Sacré Coeur viennent d'acheter à Tokyo un immense terrain (10 hectares) . . . Elles sont douze, *from Ireland, England, Belgium and France*" (sic!).
12-mo, 4 pp.

12) Letter from the same Bishop Berlioz, dated January 3, 1908, sending a description and photograph of his church in Hakodate, Northern Japan.
8-vo, 2 pp.

13) Letter in French of the same bishop, dated January 22, 1908, with remarks on his work.
8-vo, 4 pp.

14) Letter from Archbishop Agius, Manila, dated March 10, 1908, explaining that the Provincial Council of the Philippine Islands "was an imposing affair." He also comments on the desolation of some provinces. "The once beautiful churches are a mass of ruins, the palatial conventos reduced to ashes."
4-to, 4 pp., of which 2 blank.

15) Letter, photograph, and a paper on his conversion and description of mission in Weihaiwei, from F. X. Hsieh, dated Wei-Hai-Wei, March 14, 1908.
2°, 34 pp., of which 17 blank.

16) Letter from J. Francis, O.M.I., an Indian, dated Mannar, Ceylon, St. Mary's Church, describing his missionary work and joy of being ordained. An extremely zealous letter of a Hindu Catholic priest.
8-vo, 2 pp.

17) Letter from L. L. Comardy, Brother J. Dutton, C.S.C., dated on "board of steamer Asia," April 12, 1908, describing his attitude and opinion on missionary work in the Far East.
8-vo, 8 pp.

18) Letter to the Reverend A. Favis, dated Manila, May 12, 1908, with remarks on his life and work in Manila.
4-to, 4 pp., of which 2 blank.

19) Letter from F. X. Hsieh, dated Weihaiwei, China, July 8, 1908, with long and detailed description of the msisionary work of Father Hallam, the historical past of Weihaiwei, on his piety, China, etc.
2°, 10 pp., of which 5 blank.

20) Letter from W. M. Hallam, O.F.M., St. Joseph's Catholic Mission, Weihaiwei, China, September 17, 1908, informing Hudson on

"progress and prospects of this mission which has thus been so generously aided by your kindness."
8-vo, 4 pp.

21) Letter from F. X. Hsieh, now sent from H. B. M. Post Office, Liukungtau, Weihaiwei (North China), November 14, 1908. The letter is as lengthy as previous, with many interesting remarks on translations from European languages into Chinese, on magic lantern meetings, etc.
12-mo, 16 pp., of which 8 blank.

22) Letter from the same, dated November 19, 1908, sending *Hoei Pao,* Chinese weekly of the Jesuits in Shanghai, with remarks on it.
12-mo, 4 pp.

23) Letter of the same, dated November 20, 1908, a copy of the letter sent to the Chinese ambassador in Washington, Wu Ting-Fang, "His Imperial Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary."
8-vo, 4 pp., of which 2 blank.

24) Letter from the same Chinese convert, dated November 27, 1907, with remarks and a description of Chinese prayers, Catholic services, etc.
2°, 10 pp., of which 5 blank.

25) Letter from the same, dated December 15, 1908, with remarks on his trip to Shanghai, to St. Xavier College, etc.
12-mo, 8 pp.

* * *

The above list does not cover all the Hudson Papers in the Archives of the University of Notre Dame. It was thought advisable to inventory the papers and letters only up to 1908, since there are still people living who wrote letters to Father Hudson and the present writer did not wish to take excerpts from their letters without their permission.

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

Faith and History: a Comparison of Christian and Modern Views of History. By Reinhold Niebuhr. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1949. Pp. viii, 257. $3.50.)

The preface explains the genesis of this volume in several distinguished lectureships here and abroad, beginning with the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching at the Yale Divinity School in 1945. This addition to the rapidly expanding literature on this subject is not concerned with the workaday problems of historiography, but with the ultimate meaning of the whole objective course of human events. Much more than an academic comparison of the way history in this sense has been evaluated within the framework of western civilization, it is a spirited Christian apologetic based on a penetrating criticism of modern man's conception of history as a self-redemptive process. The author considers this to be the common article of faith informing modern culture and confronts the uncritical optimism engendered by it with the hard facts of contemporary experience. In this context his purpose is "to present the Christian interpretation of history in the light of this refutation through experience of modern views of history; and to re-examine the Christian view from the standpoint of what is true in the modern discovery of historical growth and development" (p. 30). In so doing the author subjects to criticism not only the secularist position, but also theological liberalism, "which merely clothed the modern secular faith in traditional phrases," and theological literalism, which "sought to prove the truth of the Christian faith by denying and defying the fact of development in nature and in history, which modern culture disclosed" *(ibid.)*.

The reader will recognize at once the nature and significance of a treatise of this scope from the pen of an eminent theologian, as well as the essential distinction in its two-fold purpose which corresponds to the dual aspect of the present crisis. For in the face of the radical divergence between the Christian and secularist positions, the problem of the Christian apologetic, already great in the circumstance, is heightened by the differences within the Christian position itself. The spirit, method, and, in large measure, the results of any present efforts in this supremely important field of the "theology of history" depend on the evaluation of the relative urgency in the situations created by these two sets of differences.

In the criticism of the secularist view of history the author moves within an area where there is wide agreement between those who share

belief in the Incarnation, the focal point of any Christian theology of history. As he particularizes his own position, the argument not only loses much of its universal validity, which is quite to be expected, but suffers from the inaccuracy of more than one summary judgment. If I may hazard a summary of what appears to be the chief charge against Catholicism with respect to the book's main theme it is this, namely, a static interpretation of history which involves a triumph over evil and the attainment of a transcendent perfection within history by the Church as an historic community (cf. pp. 29 and 239). This may place the matter in its proper setting of the theology of grace *(Gratia Christi Redemptoris)* and of the Church *(Corpus Christi, quod est Ecclesia)*, but is quite unacceptable as a *status quaestionis* since it is in neither respect true. That whatever was "static" in the mediaeval view (*v.* E. Gilson, *The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy: Gifford Lectures 1931-32* [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940], chapter 19, "The Middle Ages and History.") was peculiarly Catholic rather than a condition proper to the Christian tradition of the age, or that Catholicism has no part in a Christian view which is able to profit by the wider horizons disclosed by an enlarged common experience, are equally unacceptable assumptions. Other questions of theological interest will undoubtedly receive elsewhere an attention not possible in this brief notice. An example of current Catholic thought may be seen in the articles of Father Malavez, "La vision chrétienne de l'histoire: (I) Dans la théologie de Karl Barth (II) Dans la théol. catholique," *Nouvelle revue théologique* LXXI (1949), 113ff., and 244ff., with recent literature. And the luminous pages of Father de Lubac, *Le catholicisme: Les aspects sociaux du dogme* (Paris: 1938), have lost nothing of their timeliness.

J. Joseph Ryan

St. John's Seminary
Brighton

Johann Michael Sailer. Der weise und guetige Erzieher seines Volkes. By Josef Maria Nielen. (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag von Josef Knecht-Carolusdruckerei 1948. Pp. 521. 2.50 DM.)

Bishop Johann Michael Sailer, designated by George Goyau as the "St. Francis de Sales of Germany," lived during the period of the Enlightenment (1751-1832). Born as the son of a poor shoemaker, Sailer, after having completed his high school education in the gymnasium entered the Society of Jesus in 1770. Upon the suppression of the Jesuits he continued his philosophical and theological studies at Ingolstadt. The rest of his life reads like that of a great literary genius and spiritual leader. Ordained a priest in 1775, he became tutor in philosophy and theology,

1777-1780, and from 1780 functioned as a professor of dogmatic theology at Ingolstadt. Losing his position in 1781, Sailer devoted himself to literary activities. In 1784 he was called to Dillingen as professor of pastoral theology and ethics. He held this position for ten years enjoying alike the highest regard of his superiors and the appreciation of his students. But the jealousy of his colleagues brought about a limitation of his activities in 1793 and his sudden dismissal in 1794. He once more devoted himself to literary pursuits at Munich until 1799 when he was again called to a professorship at Ingolstadt. In 1800 he was transferred along with the university to Landshut. Here he taught pastoral and moral theology, pedagogy, homiletics, liturgy, and catechetics. He was beloved of Catholics and Protestants alike. In 1818 Sailer declined the offer of the Prussian government to become Archbishop of Cologne. In 1819 Crown Prince Louis of Bavaria nominated him Bishop of Augsburg, but the nomination was rejected by Rome. In 1821, however, after having been able to exonerate himself satisfactorily, Sailer was appointed cathedral canon of Ratisbon; in 1822 auxiliary bishop and coadjutor with the right of succession; in 1825 cathedral provost, and in 1829, after having first declined the See of Passau he became Bishop of Ratisbon.

As a bishop Sailer showed the same zeal as a shepherd of souls which had inspired his activities as a university professor. Although accused by some as a servant of the Enlightenment (even St. Clement Hofbauer and other ecclesiastics had their misgivings) he was hailed by others as a defender of the rights of the Holy See in an age when the effects of Gallicanism, Febronianism, and Josephinism had still left their definite impress on German minds. He strove to effect an inner, living, practical Christianity that would manifest itself exteriorly through charity, not through pietistical expressions of an ill-defined mysticism. He labored unceasingly for the training of a pious and intelligent clergy, attached to Rome and devoted to their high sacerdotal calling. Nevertheless, in spite of his zeal he was accused by those who did not fully understand him of heterodoxy, indifferentism, and dangerous mysticism.

So much for the man and his activities as a teacher, educator, and bishop during the period of the Enlightenment as described by the author in the first part of his book (pp. 11-99). The second part of the biography—by far the greater (pp. 103-501)—is devoted to selections or "readings" from Sailer's fluent pen touching on philosophy, theology, ascetics, liturgy, ethics, homiletics, etc. In 1794 Sailer translated into German the *Imitation of Christ* (re-edited by F. Keller in 1912) and in 1783 published a prayer book that made him beloved and esteemed wherever the German language was spoken or read. The final chapter gives the reader a selection of Sailer's correspondence.

The fact that Sailer's works have been edited by his friend in life, Josef Widmer, in forty-one volumes (Sulzbach, 1830-1845) and his name and activities perpetuated even down to our day by biographies, monographs, and literary studies is sufficient evidence of the timeliness of Nielen's new and excellent bio-bibliographical study of a great German bishop who was a contemporary of another ex-Jesuit bishop—our own immortal John Carroll. One misses, however, an index, an alphabetical bibliography, and, perhaps, a more thorough treatment of Sailer's life as a bishop. Mention indeed is made (p. 14) of the fact that one of the bishop's last crosses before death was his fruitless opposition to the civil law affecting mixed marriages, but the reader is left in complete darkness as to the exact nature of the controversy. This lack of detail seems all the more significant when one considers that only a few years later another great German bishop, Klemens August Droste zu Vischering (1773-1845) suffered prison and exile on account of his stand in the identical issue. Despite these minor lapses the work remains a valuable contribution to the study of the Enlightenment and to the evaluation of a great bishop of the Church.

RAPHAEL M. HUBER

The Catholic University of America

Die Reformation in Deutschland. 2 Vols. By Joseph Lortz. (Freiburg i/B.: Verlag Herder. 3rd ed. 1949. Pp. xii, 437; ix, 341. DM 45. or about $14.60.)

This is a factual presentation and an interpretation of the Reformation in Germany from the Catholic viewpoint. It is, at the same time, intended as a contribution toward the solution of the Ecumenical Question.

Part One, the first six chapters (pp. 1-144), attempts to give the background of this religious rebellion. The multiplicity of the concurrent factors: political, intellectual, social, religious, and ecclesiastical—all painted in with a strong brush and frank realism—render the picture one of extreme complexity. The Reformation definitely emerges as a revolutionary movement (p. 10), and Luther has rallied all the dissatisfied elements to his cause (p. 68).

Part Two consists of four books, entitled as follows: The New Religious Organization; The New Political and Ecclesiastico-Political Organization; Catholic Life: Decline and Reawakening; and The Decision Reached by a War of the Political and Military Forces.

Lack of space allows only the briefest review of the core of the work: Book One. This book fills the rest of Volume One; it deals more directly with Luther, and "Luther is the Reformation" (p. 381). Dr. Lortz's synthesis may be summarized as follows: Luther was not produced by

any outside influences or pressure, but was the result of his own scrupulosity and subjectivism and the victim of some innate fear. His personality as well as his doctrine is a confused texture of contradictions and paradoxes. On the one hand, Luther was a humble and religious man, profoundly convinced of the existence of God and trusting absolutely in the Father through Christ Crucified. He is supposed to have been a man of prayer and devoted to a close study of the Bible; he practiced a tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin and frequented as long as he lived the Sacrament of Penance, albeit as administered by one of his own colleagues (Bugenhagen). On the other hand, Luther's primary faults were colossal pride and egoism, stubbornness, conceit, and an exaggerated consciousness of a prophetic mission. With the fostering of his good qualities Luther could have been an untold force for good, and he might have become a saint. Luther must bear the responsibility for the triumph of relativism and subjectivism in the world since his time, though Erasmus had thoroughly prepared the ground for him. Incidentally, the author gives a good evaluation of Erasmus (pp. 127-136). This subjectivism was the disruption of the Church and of Germany as well (p. 408). Luther rejected reason and free will and denied man's ability to do anything for his eternal salvation. He strongly enunciated the doctrine of absolute predestination. He was not a theologian. He was also guilty of anti-Semitism (p. 374). There is no place in his doctrine for a system of morality. There is nothing particularly new in Dr. Lortz's presentation, but the synthesis is well done.

The second volume contains the three remaining books (pp. 1-293), an epilogue (pp. 294-308), a select bibliography (pp. 310-321), a three-column index (pp. 322-332), and a six-column synchronistic table: 1452-1558 (pp. 334-341).

This work is based on wide reading and deep study, but it lacks all documentation. This is unfortunate, but then it is intended primarily for the general public, and not for the professional historian.

GEORGE J. UNDREINER

Pontificial College Josephinum

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

Major Trends in American Church History. By Francis X. Curran, S.J. (New York: America Press. 1946. Pp. xviii, 198. $2.50.)

This work was rendered a pronounced disservice by the publishers. The exaggerated claims advanced in the advertising blurbs led many potential readers to expect a more exhaustive and profound presentation of the subject than that offered in the volume. Disillusionment resulted, in many instances, in these same readers, overlooking the real merits

of the book and its conformity with the author's professed scope and purpose. Father Curran's objective, as set forth in his introduction, is unpretentious—"the construction from secondary sources of an outline of the history of American Christianity . . ., to supply in a comprehensible form the essential facts of the historical evolution of [the Christian] churches in the United States."

The narrative is divided into eleven brief chapters, treating successively of the origin and subsequent cleaving of Protestanism, the colonial backgrounds of American religious history, religious freedom and ecclesiastical organization after the American Revolution, the impact of the frontier, the recurrent outbursts of intolerance toward the Catholic Church, the Negro in American religious life, the increase of unbelief, the disruption of dogmatic Protestantism, and the position of the Catholic Church in the United States in the twentieth century. Although adducing sufficient data to sustain his narrative, the author's emphasis throughout these chapters is interpretative rather than factual.

With the publication of this volume, Father Curran joins the very small group of scholars who have essayed a general study of religion in the United States, and he is the only Catholic who has attempted to do so. In one fundamental respect his presentation is distinctive. Convinced that "if generalizations are to interpret American Church history, and not merely Protestant church history, they cannot ignore either the Roman Catholic Church or the great mass of the 'unchurched,' " he devotes more space than has been customary in studies of this kind to the history of Catholicism and of infidelity. It will be difficult for anyone conversant with the realities of contemporary religious conditions in the United States to challenge objectively Father Curran's judgment in this matter. From this angle his volume is more equitably proportioned than the more ambitious works of Rowe and Sweet. The major weaknesses of the present volume spring from its preponderate reliance upon secondary sources and from its brevity. The former, however, is in accord with Father Curran's clearly expressed intention and no author can be fairly criticized for accomplishing what he set out to do. The restricted size of the volume, on the other hand, necessitated the omission or compression of details which would have clarified and buttressed his interpretations of controverted incidents. This reviewer feels that the treatment of the growth of Catholicism in the United States is the weakest feature of the volume, and he regrets that the author failed to elide some few phrases of an apologetical nature which have no place in a work of this kind.

Father Curran's volume will prove distinctly useful to the general reader interested in American religious history. It will also serve as worthwhile collateral reading for courses in American history and in church history. It will afford students of theology a glimpse into the

complexities of American religious life and thought. The appendix comprises a list of Protestant sects now existing in the United States. A bibliography of nine pages lists the works cited in the text. The author's apparent decision to limit his citations to books has resulted in a weakening of the bibliography from the standpoint of Catholic historiography. The large number of vital studies of American Catholic development that have appeared in the professional journals during the last half century find almost no mention in this bibliography.

THOMAS F. O'CONNOR

St. Louis University

Italian American History. Volume II. *The Italian Contribution to the Catholic Church in America.* By Giovanni Schiavo. (New York: Vigo Press. 1949. Pp. viii, 1056. $10.00.)

More than twenty-five years ago Mr. Schiavo began to collect information and data on the general topic of Italians in America with the obvious intention of revealing the many contributions they have made to American life. At great pains and with laudable assiduity, Mr. Schiavo has succeeded in accumulating a wealth of material on the subject to which he has devoted so many years of his life. Students and other persons interested in the Italian phenomenon in America—social, political, cultural, economic, and religious—owe Mr. Schiavo a debt of profound gratitude for his tireless efforts in making known what has long been neglected or ignored on the Italian contribution to the development of the United States.

In the present volume, which represents volume II of the series *Italian-American History,* Mr. Schiavo traces from its origin the Italian contribution to the American Catholic Church. In the first part of the volume (a little less than half of the total number of pages) Mr. Schiavo deals with the pioneer work of religious men and women of Italian birth or extraction in what now constitutes the territory of the United States. In it he also summarizes the religious activities of Italians in the West Indies and in Mexico prior to the Declaration of Independence. The second part of the volume deals with the history of Italian parishes—their origin, foundation, development, and administration. This part also contains brief biographical sketches of the religious men who were primarily identified with the parishes. The author is correct when he states in the foreword that in future years this section of the volume should prove of great value not only for the history of the American Church, but also for the history of Italian emigration because quite naturally these parishes were born, grew, and some eventually disappeared in accordance

with the tide of emigration and the shifting of the Italian communities from one section of a city to another.

However, while the volume is packed tight with highly important and interesting facts and details, this reviewer feels that Mr. Schiavo has not sufficiently assimilated the material he has brought together so as to give the reader a concise, accurate, and well-documented history on the Italian contribution of the Catholic Church to American life, especially to the life of the Italians who emigrated to the United States. Rather than list names and facts, which in themselves may be interesting, this reviewer believes that it is far more important to present a composite picture of the spiritual needs of the Italian Catholics and then demonstrate how those needs have been satisfied. It is not so important to know who the founder of a given church was in some remote section of this country, nor is it important to have biographical sketches of the priests who were identified with the various parishes. It is far more essential to find out what a particular parish may have contributed to the spiritual life of the community in which it was founded.

Since the book is and will be extremely important as a source book of information, it is regrettable that Mr. Schiavo did not supply a careful and complete index of the names, places, and churches referred to in the text.

HOWARD R. MARRARO

Columbia University

Eloquent Indian. The Life of James Bouchard, California Jesuit. By John Bernard McGloin, S.J. (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press. 1949. Pp. xvii, 380. $5.00.)

A complete history of the Catholic Church in California and in the other States of the Pacific Slope during the decades immediately following the gold rush has still to take form. Indeed, it can scarcely be written until a whole series of local studies and biographies of key figures has been prepared from source materials all too scarce and none too well preserved. Some of this spade work is being done, but not enough. Here is an almost unexplored field for competent research by Catholic historians.

In the face of this long neglect, it is a pleasure to discover that Father McGloin has devoted years of painstaking research to this period and as a result now presents to us a scholarly monograph on the missionary career of that ubiquitous and indefatigable Jesuit preacher and lecturer, James Bouchard, the Eloquent Indian, whose field of operation was literally the whole Pacific Coast.

The author naturally begins by sketching for us briefly the backgrounds against which Father Bouchard's life was to be lived. He deals in his first three chapters with a report on the condition of religion during the decade just before the gold rush; with an account of the incorporation of the diocese of the Californias into the hierarchical system of the United States and the appointment of the Dominican, Joseph Sadoc Alemany, to head the see; and with the establishment of the Jesuits in San Francisco.

Father McGloin next presents his hero to us in the five chapters of Part Two, telling of his birth in the Delaware tribe of a French mother, describing his life as a student for the Protestant ministry in Ohio, relating the manner of his conversion to the Catholic Church and his entry into the Society of Jesus, followed by a not altogether peaceful ministry of six years in the Middle West and bringing him to San Francisco in 1861 where he began the work which made his mark at the age of 38.

San Francisco was the central point from which Father Bouchard operated from 1861 until his death in 1889. Eloquence was his strong point, rather than erudition. Hence he shone in the pulpit and on the platform rather than in the classroom. This quality attracted throngs of listeners wherever he appeared. Whether he preached a routine Sunday sermon, conducted the exercises of a parish mission, or entered the arena of controversy in an age when anti-Catholic bigotry was bitter and outspoken, crowds pressed about him.

His eloquence even got him into difficulties with the pastors of the city and the Archbishop, who entertained the orthodox, even though unspectacular, notion that parish lines are to be respected, even by "Eloquent Indians," and that the good pastor is responsible for his sheep, even though he speaks with a foreign accent. In treating this phase of Father Bouchard's career, a sort of Thomist versus Molinist controversy between the Dominican Archbishop and the Jesuit preacher, our good friend Father McGloin seems to remain an uncompromising Molinist throughout.

One wonders too why prejudice rather than principle seemed to guide the Redskin orator in his demand that the "Chinese must go." In this connection too this reviewer was puzzled all through by the strange silence during his career in the West about Father Bouchard's Indian blood and his seeming failure to interest himself in his racial brothers, much neglected after the secularization of the missions.

Unbelievable almost, to one who knows what the old roads were like, is the account of the journeys of Father Bouchard, lecturer and missionary. The parishes in which he preached could almost serve as an index to the Catholic Directory for those years, from Los Angeles to Victoria and Montana, from Salt Lake to Honolulu.

Father McGloin has done a really worthwhile piece of research in a little explored field. His chapters are well documented and he has added an adequate index. This reviewer joins Bishop Armstrong in the hope expressed in his preface that Father McGloin and others will continue the work of opening for us the story of the parishes and people who made the mining camps good as well as golden.

✠ THOMAS K. GORMAN
Bishop of Reno

GENERAL HISTORY

Legal Philosophy from Plato to Hegel. By Huntington Cairns. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1949. Pp. xv, 583. $7.50.)

This book—the third of four volumes treating the problem of jurisprudence—is a part of an ambitious but welcome attempt of the author "to construct the foundation of a Theory of Law which is the necessary antecedent of a possible jurisprudence" (preface). The first volume of this series *(Law and the Social Sciences,* 1935) looks at law and the study of law from the angle of the social sciences; the second *(The Theory of Legal Science,* 1941), treats law from the standpoint of logic and of the methods of the empirical sciences. Both books have, deservedly, found much recognition.

The third volume represents a study of the philosophies of law of the great figures in the development of western civilization. The purpose of this study is not to give a mere factual history of legal philosophy but to search for the problems which the great philosophers found significant enough for intensive and extensive studies and, then, by comparative methods, to evaluate critically the solutions of these problems offered by the great philosophers. All this is to serve as a basis for a definite system of jurisprudence, distinguished from legal philosophy as well as from the study of positive law for practical purposes; of a jurisprudence as the basic science for and of the realm of "the laws." The aim is comparable, thus, to the effort of a Jhering, of a Hauriou, and of Kelsen's pure theory, though the author's intellectual *habitus* makes him obviously no partisan of the latter. Jurisprudence up to the last of the great philosophical systems, that of Hegel, was a daughter of philosophy but was, then, with the rise of positivism as a general philosophical—and rather ascetic—mood, cast adrift. It might, perhaps, become an autonomous separate science sturdy enough to stand alone. But this seems to the author to be possible only if jurisprudence remains aware of its origins and knows that it ought to be, as it were, imbedded in a broader realm of a universal philosophy. The author closes his book appropriately with the famous

quotation of Plato on the "synoptical man," the man who has a full conspectus of knowledge.

The great philosophers whose legal philosophies are presented reach from Plato to Hegel, the last of the system-building minds to study the essence and functions of law, moral and juridical, as a part of their philosophical systems. The other legal philosophies discussed are those of Aristotle, Cicero, Thomas Aquinas, Leibniz, Francis Bacon, Hobbes, Spinoza, Locke, Hume, Kant, and Fichte. There is no reason for criticizing the author for this selection though other authors would have made other selections for different though equally justifiable reasons. Mr. Cairns' presentation of these legal philosophies is made highly interesting by many cross-references and by illustrations from legal history and from contemporary court decisions. The studies are generally good, objective and reliable and show an excellent understanding of the various legal philosophies which proves the author's vast familiarity with the works and thoughts of the philosophers from Plato to Hegel. The author's judgment about the natural law in Thomas Aquinas' thought would be less critical if he had taken into consideration the theory of natural law as developed by the students of Aquinas in the sixteenth century from Vittoria to Bellarmine in their great treatises, *On the Laws,* or *On Justice and on the Laws.* It seems, furthermore, to the reviewer that the remarks on pages 165-166 are too much influenced by Ernest Troeltsch's ideas on the subject of the compromise of Christian ethical ideals and the demands of the "world," ideas which have been criticized among others by Otto Schilling in several of his research works. The chapter on Leibniz deserves special praise. Leibniz is presented as the opponent of legal positivism which, rejecting all values, threw overboard the grand tradition that "the central enduring problem of jurisprudence is the determination of a just legal order" (p. 323). After all, positivism all too quickly declares problems as insoluble and thus meaningless, which to a deeper insight might be better called inexhaustible.

The author's strictures on the shortcomings of Kantian formalism are impressive and valuable; they are in agreement with Scheler's criticism of Kant's ethical formalism and Erich Kaufmann's critique of neo-Kantian legal philosophy and apply thus to the pure theory of law of Hans Kelsen and his followers. Despite these strictures, I find the chapter on Kant deservedly sympathetic, calling to mind that around his tomb are now tramping the boots of Red Army soldiers. The author's short remarks (on p. 546) on dispensation by ecclesiastical authority from promises made under oath are open to—unintended—misinterpretation of the Church's doctrine which is more nuancé and elaborate. These

few critical remarks do not mean at all to belittle the value of this book. It remains one of the best histories of legal philoosphy and its principal representative thinkers and, thus, makes the reader look forward to the next volume on jurisprudence with great eagerness.

HEINRICH ROMMEN

College of St. Thomas

The Idea of Usury. From Tribal Brotherhood to Universal Otherhood. By Benjamin N. Nelson. [History of Ideas Series, No. 3] (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1949. Pp. xxi, 258. $3.00.)

The studies of Max Weber have been aimed at showing that the West gradually adopted a universalist morality conducive to capitalistic enterprise and that the breakdown of fraternal and tribal associations prepared the way for a new kind of brotherhood, universal rather than tribal, competitive rather than co-operative, which Nelson calls the Universal Otherhood. The present work attempts to illustrate the transformation of the tribal morality of Jewish society, through the universal brotherhood of mediaeval Christianity, to modern utilitarian liberalism by tracing the evolution of the text of *Deuteronomy* (xxiii, 19-20) on usury: "Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother, money, victuals or anything. Unto a stranger thou mayest lend at usury, but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend at usury." This text was commented upon by some of the fathers, notably by St. Ambrose from whose writings a passage found its way into the *Decretum* of Gratian, thus offering itself for further explanations by the numerous mediaeval commentators of this work. St. Ambrose appears to link up together the right to exact usury and the right to wage war or to injure an enemy. It was interpreted in various ways, some even denying its authenticity. In any case, it was soon recognized as an embarrassing text because if Christians claimed its authority for exacting usury of their enemies, heretics, Jews, pagans, Saracens, etc., the Jews equally claimed that it justified their lending upon usury to Christians. The author has carefully traced the problem through the mediaeval texts and has made full use of an abundant secondary literature on the subject. He points out that even the most accommodating of the mediaeval casuists never presumed to question the assumption that the taking of usury was opposed to the Christian spirit of universal brotherhood.

That step was taken by the leaders of the Protestant revolt and the major part of this volume is devoted to an examination of their writings. For political, social, and economic reasons those whom the author characterizes as conservative reformers, Luther, Melanchthon, Bucer and Zwingli, declared the Mosaic law dead, without power to bind in con-

science. Even the New Testament with its prohibition against usury was not intended as a civil constitution for the direction of the world. Calvin and the advocates of modern capitalism rejected the discrimination against the alien by appealing to the notion of universal brotherhood, while at the same time they condemned the prohibition against usury by appealing to the fact that there was no absolute prohibition in the Deuteronomic text. It was to introduce a new kind of universalism wherein the members would apply to one another the rules originally laid down for the treatment of aliens. Mr. Nelson's conclusion: "In modern capitalism, all are brothers in being equally others," could, I believe, be stated in another way: "In modern capitalism, all are aliens because there are no longer any brothers."

This is an interesting book which merits careful reading and reflection. It is not intended to be a history of the doctrine of the morality of usury but to trace the evolution of the concept of society as evidenced in the career of one fundamental text on the subject of usury. Those familiar with the history of the problem of usury may be somewhat disappointed that relatively too much space has been given to the history while the main theme might have been more fully developed. It is dealt with chiefly in the foreword, the introduction and a three page epilogue. Perhaps, as the concluding note to this part of the book (p. 137; cf. also p. 221) would seem to suggest, the writer has not yet worked out the problem to his own satisfaction. We hope that further studies will follow.

TERENCE P. MCLAUGHLIN

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
Toronto

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

Catalan Domination of Athens 1311-1388. By Kenneth M. Setton. (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1948. Pp. xv, 323. VIII plates. $7.50; to members of the Academy, $6.00.)

This excellent history of Athens under Catalan rule is based upon a comprehensive study of all published sources which are fully described and discussed in a concluding chapter of forty pages. Much more valuable than a mere bibliography, this chapter, a real guide for the scholarly reader, particularly rich in information regarding Rubió y Lluch's numerous publications (most of them written in Catalan), includes also a note on the documents preserved in the State Archives of Venice, as well as a chronological list of all collections of papal documents from John XXII to Boniface IX. In both the Venetian and the Vatican Archives there remains, indeed, a large amount of unpublished material where some supplementary details could be discovered. But they would

not affect the general picture so ably presented by Professor Setton except, perhaps, with regard to minor points, e.g., the question whether the international congress convoked by Pope Gregory XI in 1372 really gathered in Thebes the following year.

In addition to eight chapters which contain the political history of Catalan domination in Greece, with frequent references to the activities of the Avignonese Papacy studied in a preliminary article of the author (*Byzantion,* XVII, 1944-45), we find in his book two particularly interesting chapters on civil and ecclesiastical administration under the Catalans, and on language, culture, social conditions, and Athenian antiquities. The latter chapter covers not only the Catalan but also the Florentine period of Athens, and another chapter continues the political history of Catalan Athens by a survey of the history of the city under the Florentine Acciajuoli, including the interlude of Venetian rule (1395-1403) and leading to the Turkish conquest three years after the fall of Constantinople.

The special monograph on that later period of Athens' history (1388-1456) which Professor Setton is planning, will complete his present publication, and those who miss an exhaustive discussion of the earlier role of the Catalans in the East, will be glad to know that a dissertation on "The Catalan Great Company: Their Wars with the Turks, Byzantium, and Frankish Greece 1302-1311," prepared by Robert I. Burns, S.J., in the Fordham University Graduate School, is ready for print. But as it is, Professor Setton's book certainly constitutes the most important contribution to the fascinating and intricate history of the Latin East in the fourteenth century which has been published in recent years.

OSCAR HALECKI

Fordham University

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Erasmus, Tyndale and More. By William E. Campbell. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode; Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1949. Pp. xi, 288. $5.00.)

A collaborator with Chambers and Reed in editing the first two volumes of More's English *Works,* Mr. Campbell is now completing the remaining five volumes. This book, obviously a labor of many years, partly retraces Seebohm's long-standard *Oxford Reformers,* but carries beyond 1519, where Seebohm ended, to the deaths of the three reformers. In making Tyndale the third figure, replacing Colet (who still has importance here), Campbell thus cuts more deeply into the storm-center of the English religious revolt. Like Seebohm he keeps the individuals clearly before our eyes. The light is good and the proportions are well kept: Erasmus and Tyndale and More share our interest.

We cannot expect the fullness of Chambers on More or Mozley on Tyndale; we find, e.g., little of More's pastimes, his history-writing, and nothing of his legal activities; for these we must turn to Chambers. Campbell must select, and this he does well. Yet there are some valuable contributions, e.g., the handling of More's controversial writings, and the emphasis on *Utopia* as a dialogue in form (p. 87) and the related discussion of the modification of scholastic disputation into dialogue. This is necessary for understanding More's (and other Tudor) dialogues.

The book's chief contribution seems to be the tension maintained between More and Tyndale, with Erasmus now the center of interest and now like the theme of Christian humanism running quietly through the book. For this it is a worthy extension of Seebohm.

Unfortunately, the volume is somewhat carelessly put together. Typographically not pleaasnt to read (no distinction between hyphen and long dash, and often poor distinction between long quotations and main text), there are misspellings such as "limped" and "early" for "limpid" and "easily," (p. 39) and mistakes in proofreading. The index is inadequate and inaccurate; the bibliography (not compiled by the author) is weak and to be corrected by and supplemented with Sullivans' *Moreana* (1946) and Read's *Tudor Bibliography* (1933), and one misses such recent works as Miss Rogers' edition of More's correspondence (1947). More seriously, quotations are not accurately reproduced: e.g., for "could imitate" read "would dream of imitating" (p. 191); for "his strong disapproval" read "the bitterest hatred he was capable of feeling" (p. 176). The quotations from Roper's and Harpsfield's lives of More seem often to be conflated readings and not from the editions cited. Frequently portions of quoted material are italicized (or there are changes in punctuation, or omissions or additions) without indication. These flaws should be eliminated in a revised edition, for this is a significant book.

RICHARD J. SCHOECK

Cornell University

France 1814-1940. By J. P. T. Bury. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1949. Pp. xii, 348. $4.00.)

It has been considered juvenile for some time to praise a book unstintingly, particularly as filling a need in some particular field or other. But the short work (less than 400 pages) *France 1814-1940* by J. P. T. Bury deserves fulsome praise as being a needed and well-fashioned work. The work was needed as there are all too few good compendiums in English of the history of France, particularly of modern France. The book is in reality a detailed outline and an outline like this is perhaps the hardest thing to prepare, falling easily between the Scylla and Charybdis

of being either too detailed or insufficiently detailed. The one criticism that might be leveled on that score, although this is largely a matter of opinion, is that the author might have used his limited space for more detail in the political field, leaving the allied fields of social studies to a larger work. Too often the last few paragraphs of each chapter are reduced to a catalogue of names, indicative it is true of the position of Frenchmen in the various social and economic fields, but contributing nothing solid beyond a "hint" at the full splendor of some of their achievements.

One would have to have the background of the author to competently substantiate or refute many of his controversial statements, but even the average reviewer can remark the degree of fairness and objectivity attained by Professor Bury. The commendation of being objective in referring to institutions and their relations to the whole fabric of a society is extremely hard to attain, particularly when these institutions run counter to our whole way of life. No one can be absolutely objective, but the author has shown a remarkable degree of fair-mindedness in regard to the difficult subject of the relations of Church and State in France. As an example of this objectivity one might cite his concluding remark on the unilateral abrogation of the Concordat of 1801, where he says, "the new settlement was neither just nor generous, but in the end it worked better than the old" (p. 205). True one can take exception to his attitude toward the secession of the Catholic cantons in the Swiss civil war (p. 65), and toward the Syllabus of Modern Errors (p. 84), as being indicative of a sentimental attachment to an outmoded Liberalism. But he equally attacks the nefarious practices of free-masonry, particularly within the French Army of the Third Republic (p. 198).

There are very many advantages to this work. It is a detailed outline of French history during a century of extraordinary changes in French life and history. This book reviews the whole situation to the fall of France in 1940 in as brief a compass as possible, yet thoroughly. Indeed the author pauses occasionally to successfully recapitulate the social and economic progress of France. The arrangement of the chapters is excellent, well apportioned and each provided with a good bibliography. Hence the book provides the serious student with a bird's-eye view of his subject and the casual reader with a readable compendium of modern French history.

VINCENT M. MCDONALD

St. Albert's Junior Seminary
Middletown

The Recollections of Alexis de Tocqueville. Edited with an Introduction by J. P. Mayer. Translated by Alexander Teixeira de Mattos. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1949. Pp. xxvi, 332. $5.00.)

Tocqueville's *Recollections* are a rich source for the study of the Revolution of 1848. In 1942 Luc Monnier re-edited the *Souvenirs,* restoring a considerable number of fragments suppressed in the original edition of 1893. [Cf. Tocqueville, *Souvenirs,* Ed. by Luc Monnier. "Mémoires du passé pour servir au temps présent" (Paris: Gallimard, 1942).] J. P. Mayer's present English edition includes these restorations. He provides also a thoughtful, interpretive introduction, a brief bibliography, and a translation of a significant speech on the "Roman Question" which Tocqueville, as Foreign Minister, delivered in the Legislative Assembly on October 19, 1849.

Mayer, an admiring biographer of Tocqueville, insists that Tocqueville is to be pre-eminently understood as a sociologist. This biased opinion should not frighten the student of history away from the *Recollections.* The truth is that Tocqueville understood the Revolution with the mind of a politician, an historian, and an artist. In the *Recollections* these three sources of his intelligence are served by a magnificent style which even in a late Victorian English translation makes the reading of this book a rare experience.

Tocqueville deliberately restricted his memoir to the period in which he was a close witness of the Revolution's history, from its beginning in 1848 until October, 1849 when Louis Napoleon dismissed him from his post as Minister of Foreign Affairs. During these months, in which the eventual fate of the Second Republic was decided, Tocqueville worked unsuccessfully to give it a permanent existence. His failure was in part due to his uncanny insight into the prospect of a plebiscitarian dictatorship rising in answer to the social demands of the Revolution. When this insight became an overpowering fear, it made it impossible for Tocqueville, or his circle, to believe in the sincerity of those who hoped to develop the social responsibilities of the Republic without sacrificing the freedom of its citizens. This division among those who supported the Second Republic gave Louis Napoleon his opportunity to destroy that Repubic.

Despite the personal and public failure which underlies the *Recollections,* there is as yet no superior effort to understand the Revolution of 1848. It is only matched by Karl Marx's achievement in his *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.*

EDWARD GARGAN

Boston College

Italy from Napoleon to Mussolini. By René Albrecht-Carrié. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1950. Pp. xiii, 314. $4.25.)

Modern Italy provides a challenge to the historian. The first European people to turn aside from Parliamentary government, the Italians accepted the dictatorship of Mussolini without being impressed by the clumsy justifications elaborated to defend it. They were content to be governed by the lictors' rods as long as things went well, though the dictator knew what the traffic would bear and wisely refrained from applying the logic of the all-inclusive state. When the sacrifices appeared too great and the promised golden age was delayed beyond their expectation, Italians reacted strongly and provided the most courageous and effective resistance movement in Europe, belying the rather dismal records of their armies. If it is the business of the historian to explain the present in the light of the past, certainly here is a field for his talents.

The sympathy of British liberals for the *risorgimento* gave rise to a considerable body of historical literature in English on nineteenth-century Italy. But college teachers have felt the need of a one-volume summary of this material, which would relate it to the rise of Fascism. The volume under review attempts to fill this need.

To the author, Italian Fascism was a synthetic aberration, a product "of an opportunistic adaptation to circumstances and conditions which are the fundamental realities of our time . . . as these appeared on the Italian scene." The tensions of the war and the peace settlement, superimposed on the fundamental weaknesses of the young nation, had created a political vacuum. Yet Fascism was not inevitable; the decisive role was played by personalities and accidents. Had someone been available to turn a "wiff of grapeshot" on Mussolini's ruffians, had the Socialists been courageous enough to assume the responsibilities of government, had popular weariness not put a premium upon recklessness, the crisis might have passed and the old system recovered. But although "there was nothing inevitable about the advent of Fascism in October 1922, in view of the background of political life as it had been conducted in Italy since she had become one, this advent may also be called a perfectly logical consequence."

The author realizes that this is neither dramatic nor satisfying, yet rejecting the deterministic approach, he attempts to arrange the material of Italian history to sustain it. After a twenty-five page sketch of Italy before Napoleon, Professor Albrecht-Carrié tells the familiar story of unification. He emphasizes the similarity between the Italian and German national movements, and points out that since Cavour did not have a powerful Prussia at his disposal, he did not leave an inheritance of confidence in military power; nor did he, like Bismarck, survive long enough to shape the new state his skill had created.

The author is a careful scholar who concerns himself chiefly with narrative and who takes cautious positions on all controverted questions. In my opinion, his book fails to be a major contribution, not because of any historical incompetence of the author, but because of self-imposed limitations. The volume is too scanty for the student of modern Italian history—the entire period up to the rise of Fascism is treated in 127 pages! This brevity entails avoiding all difficult issues, e.g., the role of the *Popolari* is dismissed in three lines with the observation that the position of Don Sturzo has been the subject of much controversy. Again the relations of Church and State in Fascist Italy fill one paragraph, and though the summary is eminently fair and correct, it hardly throws sufficient light on this complex question. Thus while too brief to be an adequate guide for the student, the volume lacks the depth of an interpretative essay. Balance it has; to take one example, the treatment of Italian foreign policy before and after Mussolini is judicious. This refreshing moderation makes the work valuable as an introduction for the general reader. But it seems to this reviewer that it would have been possible to retain this value and yet deepen and broaden the scope of the volume. Certainly the author has given evidence of the required talents for the task.

JOSEPH N. MOODY

Cathedral College
New York

AMERICAN HISTORY

A History of the Old South. By Clement Eaton. (New York: Macmillan Company, 1949. Pp. ix, 636. $5.00.)

It was audacious to undertake a history of the Old South before the appearance of the ten-volume history of the South now in process. But Professor Eaton, who has taught, studied, and written in the field of the Old South, had the audacity and has written what is easily the best and most complete one-volume coverage of the field.

Eschewing well-known integrating theses such as white supremacy, nationalism, colonial status, conscious political minority status, and rurality, he has made the integrating theme of his study of the Old South "the emergence of a regional culture created by all classes of Southern society rather than by an elite, aristocratic group." As indicated by the nine to twenty-nine citations at the end of each chapter and by the twenty-five-page bibliographiy at the end of the volume, Professor Eaton has drawn upon the research of himself and many others to produce a synthesis which is largely factual and descriptive of the South from early colonial days to the secession of the Southern states in 1860-61. One-third

of the volume is devoted to the period before the Missouri Compromise from which the South as a highly self-conscious section is generally dated. The author's South is broad and complex. He treats of politics, slave labor, agriculture, commerce, manufacturers, religion, social structure, culture, and literature. Much attention is given to the non-slaveholding classes who comprised the majority of the white population. In fact the author's integrating theme is so nebulous and his South so broad and complex that one questions whether the Negro, the plantation system, the problem of slavery in the territories, the spirit of Southern political nationalism, and the consciousness of being a minority section whose way of life was under attack loom as large in the book as they did in Southern life and thought and action before 1860. Politics and the South's distinctiveness appear to be somewhat minimized. For a Southerner, Mr. Eaton maintains a high sense of objectivity and critical evaluation. Now he seems sympathetic with and then critical toward the South. His account is factual, balanced and unbiased.

It is difficult to see wherein references to Franklin D. Roosevelt, the New Deal, Harry Hopkins, the Committee on Un-American Activities, and the United Nations add anything to the story of the Old South. The frequent use of "hedonistic" is somewhat distracting.

Allotted space does not permit the listing and correction of errors noted. Minor grammatical errors appear on pages 90, 213, 256, and 508. There are several errors of fact (pages 143, 148, 149, 208, 329, 393, and 419), the most conspicuous of which is the statement that Vermont, which was not a state until 1791, rather than New Hampshire, was the ninth state to ratify the Federal Constitution. Questionable interpretations appear on pages 213, 299, 428, 470, and 544 respecting Jackson's nationalism, the Specie Circular, manufacturing in the 1850's, immigration, and Webster.

But a few errors and questionable interpretations do not greatly impair the superior quality of Mr. Eaton's book. Several illustrations and maps add to its attractiveness and the index is usable.

ALBERT R. NEWSOME

University of North Carolina

Plain Folk of the Old South. By Frank Lawrence Owsley. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1949. Pp. xxi, 235. $3.50.)

The author, a native of Alabama, has been a teacher of history in southern colleges and universities for many years. His *Plain Folks of the Old South* is the work of a scholar who has read widely of published literature dealing with the life in the early rural South and who has

evidently done considerable research work among original documents such as private letters and public records. Copious footnotes attest to this.

It is a study of the sturdy pioneers who settled the Southland. First came the herdsmen who subsisted primarily in a grazing and hunting economy. The public domains furnished rich pasture land where cattle, sheep, swine, horses, and mules could be profitably raised and later driven many miles to the market in the cities. These people were constantly moving from place to place in search of better pastures, and they built but rude huts for their homes. Then came the agricultural immigrants to possess the land, to build more stable homes, and to establish rural communities which in the course of time were to grow into our towns. They were a people of simple lives who had to carve out of the wilderness their homes and the means of their subsistence.

In the chapter on "Southern Folkways" glimpses are given of the manners of these pioneers—their struggles, religious services, social gatherings, and home life. Neighbors usually lived far apart, but were drawn together at times for religious and social gatherings, and to help each other in clearing land, building homes, and other pioneer projects. Interesting accounts are given of the religious camp meetings held in the late summer when the crops were laid by; of the "house raising" or the gathering of the communities to build a house for a newcomer to the neighborhood, or for a newly married couple; of "log rolling" or the clearing of new ground for farming; of corn shuckings—all of these served to bring together the families of the communities in a co-operative work, ending invariably in a feast and a general merry-making.

The book abounds in tables of statistics gathered from sample counties in the southern states. These statistics concern land owner and non-land owners, slave holders and non-slave holders, farm lands, their size and value, and other kindred subjects.

✠ Richard O. Gerow
Bishop of Natchez

Seizure of Territory: The Stimson Doctrine and Related Principles in Legal Theory and Diplomatic Practice. By Robert Langer. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1947. Pp. viii, 313. $3.50.)

At first sight Mr. Langer's purpose seems to be the judicious presentation of documentary evidence regarding the more recent treatment of "seizure of territory" in legal theory and diplomatic practice. If the book is to be nothing else but a case history, the author has rendered a valuable service. He presents the reader with three well docu-

mented parts dealing with the history of the problem, and with its legal and diplomatic aspcts respectively.

However, in a very short preface and a brief conclusion—the only places in which Mr. Langer states his own opinion—he seemed to indicate that his central idea had been a more ambitious one. The author obviously wanted to present the reader with an attorney's brief in favor of the Stimson Doctrine "and related principles" in order to prove that in the field under review the Roman maxim, *Ex iniuria ius non oritur*, was slowly gaining ground as compared with its antagonist, the slogan, *Macht geht vor Recht*. Disappointingly, however, Mr. Langer fails to substantiate the claims made by introducing his central idea. Within the framework chosen by him he had to fail since state practice contradicts his hypothesis. Ambassador Jessup in his, *A Modern Law of Nations* (New York, 1948; p. 162), gives expression to state practice when he says with respect to the Stimson non-recognition doctrine that it ". . . is referred to merely as an indication of a precedent which may be inspired with reality in a more adequately organized international community." Mr. Jessup's opinion has been amplified in a communication from the British Foreign Office to the UN (UN Doc. A/CN. 4/2; p. 111); there the Foreign Office stated "Mere non-recognition (i.e. of territorial acquisitions), when the community of States does not fulfill the function of preventing or restoring acquisitions by illegal force, has not appeared to serve any useful purpose but has, instead, tended to create innumerable legal fictions . . ."

However valuable as a purely historical statement, Mr. Langer's positivistic approach unfortunately prevents him from making a deeper and more constructive analysis of recognition of seized territory.

WILLIAM H. ROBERTS

The Catholic University of America

LATIN-AMERICAN HISTORY

Coronado on the Turquoise Trail, Knight of Pueblos and Plains. By Herbert E. Bolton. Coronado Cuarto Centennial Publications, Vol. I. (Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1949. Pp. xvi, 491. $8.00.)

Coronado, Knight of Pueblos and Plains. By Herbert E. Bolton. (New York: Whittlesey House: McGraw-Hill Book Company and Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1949. Pp. xii, 491. $6.00.)

Barring the slight difference in the wording of the title, these two volumes are identical as far as preface, text, references, bibliography, and

index are concerned. Whereas the first, the Coronado centennial volume, has a frontispiece depicting the "Discovery of the Grand Canyon" and three maps relative to the Coronado expedition, these are lacking in the Whittlesey House edition. In general make-up the centennial edition is the more elaborate and durable one, destined for those who some ten years ago had pre-subscribed to the centennial series, whereas the other is the cheaper market edition.

The work is divided into thirty-five chapters. There is a valuable rials," and "lost documents." Of the three maps in the centennial edition, the first traces the route of "Coronado in Pueblo Land," the second depicts "The Barrancas" in north-central Texas, and the third traces the routes of "Coronado and his Contemporaries" in northwestern Mexico and the northern Spanish frontier from Florida to California. This last map, carefully compiled by Doctor Bolton himself, is beautifully executed.

Besides examining every available source of information in point of written testimony, the author has in course of years personally covered on foot and in all sorts of conveyances the entire route of the Coronado expedition. Hence it is safe to say that, unless future researches and investigations bring new facts to light, the story told in this volume need never be told again. Master that he is of the related documentary materials and tireless seeker after facts, Doctor Bolton does not enter into points of controversy concerning the expedition. He rightly presents the results of his investigations and lets it go at that. One can be reasonably certain that what he states is correct. He has rendered a distinct and lasting service to students of Spanish American history and for this they owe him a debt of gratitude. The present reviewer congratulates him on his great achievement and hopes this excellent and fascinating recital of the story of Coronado's ventures in our Spanish borderlands will receive the wide circulation it so richly deserves.

FRANCIS BORGIA STECK

Quincy College

NOTES AND COMMENTS

On May 15 in the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library of Congress President Harry S. Truman lent his presence to the dignified ceremony marking the publication of the first volume of the papers of Thomas Jefferson. He received the first and especially bound copy of the work, the first fruits of the Princeton University-New York *Times* project, which when completed will comprise fifty-two volumes. In the course of his remarks the President called for a greater interest in collecting and publishing the writings of other men and women, "who have made major contributions to the development of our democracy." He specified that the possibilities should be explored of editing the papers not only of outstanding politicians, but of artists, labor leaders, industrialists, and other important persons. The Archivist of the United States was designated to prepare a report for the president on that matter, for although President Truman's idea was that this work should be done by local and independent groups the federal government would remain actively interested in it.

The President did not mention specifically that this new task of the National Historical Publications Commission should include any investigation of the possibility of publishing the papers of American religious leaders, but this was implicit in his words. American Catholics have rarely reached the state of progress in their archival and manuscript depositories which is marked by the publication of documents. The works of John England were published in 1849 under his successor in Charleston and again in 1908. More as personal labors of love the public papers of Archbishop Hughes and Orestes Brownson were printed for public use. None of these included even selected personal papers of these leaders, nor were they done in scientific fashion. There have been other editions of leading Catholics' public pronouncements and even a voluminous potpourri on Cardinal Gibbons edited by John T. Reily. However, the Church in the United States has not kept up with the Canadian metropolitan Sees of Quebec and Montreal, where long series of publications of their pastorals and other official statements have been edited in the past. With the advent of the best archival economy there should come at least the desire for something that the Church in the United States has yet to see, namely, critically edited compilations of official documents and even the most important private papers of clerical and lay leaders. In this regard, in keeping with the wisdom of President Truman's remarks, the individual dioceses and institutions might look to their own responsibilities.

In the current discussions about racial and religious intolerance the explanations given usually take one of two forms. One explanation sup-

poses that the cause of this kind of agitation is the sudden growth of a foreign group whether foreign in race, nationality, or religion. The other finds the cause of the agitation to be the desire to place upon some minority the blame for certain failures or defects in the dominant faction. Both of these explanations fit descriptively many occurrences in European and American history since the beginning of the nineteenth century. One explanation that has not been given sufficient importance is the growing prosperity and subsequent aggression of the dominant group. Bigotry and bitterness between racial, social, or religious groups are not intensified by depression or disaster. As a matter of fact, such tensions are usually lessened in periods of disaster. On the other hand a certain amount of prosperity must be supposed in cases of aggression of one group against another. In most cases where the first explanation—the influx of a growth of a foreign creed, race, or nationality—is given as the excuse, that excuse merely covers up the desire to expand or intensify the activity or influence of the dominant group. More emphasis should be given in these studies to pure aggression instead of relying entirely on the scapegoat theory or the fear of the intruder excuse to explain these persecutions of minorities.

The trend in some Catholic colleges to take up the study of the Great Books in place of the traditional American collegiate program has some severe effects on the teaching of history in those colleges. In the first place the planners of those programs seem to have an aversion to history as such. Although there are many historical writings listed among the so-called Great Books, these historical books are not read from the viewpoint of critical history. A department of history as such would be eliminated, although some planners of these programs are willing to admit that there must be historical lectures on the background of the books. Historians have no objection to the use of the seminar method in some classes, nor do they object to the use of primary materials in the study of the past, but they should have strong objection to the substitution of philosophical speculation for critical knowledge of the story of the human past. Another tendency noticeable in some college curricula is the substitution of a course in modern history from 1500 for the civilization courses which extended from creation to the present day. Despite the difficulties of covering a large span of history in a single course, those difficulties hardly justify the elimination of the study of ancient and mediaeval history.

The "Report of the Librarian" in the *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* (Volume 59, Part 2) points out the rich resources of the Worcester collection for a study of the early history of the Catholic

Church in the United States as well as of the later Catholic immigrant groups.

Details of the consecration of Bishop Frederick Zadok Rooker to the See of Jaro, Philippine Islands, on June 14, 1903, have been wanting. While it is known that the consecration was performed by Sebastian Cardinal Martinelli, in Rome, the names of the co-consecrators and the place of the rite have been hard to discover. Father Bartholomew F. Fair, Secretary of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia has, however, found in the Philadelphia *Catholic Standard and Times* of June 20, 1903, a despatch which locates the ceremony at the Church of Santa Maria dell'Umiltà, attached to the North American College, and which names as co-consecrators "the Archbishop of Camilli and the Bishop of Virili." The only prelates to whom these confused names can possibly allude are Archbishop Nicolà Camilli, O.M.C., and Bishop Raffaele Virili, both at that time in Rome. Nicolà Giuseppe Camilli, O.M.C. (1840-1916), had been residential Bishop of Jassi, Romania, from 1884 to 1895, and was to return to that see in 1904 to remain until his death. In the interim, having been named titular Archbishop of Tomi, he was in residence in Rome. Raffaele Virili (1849-1925) was a member of the Roman Curia. As such he was elevated to the titular See of Troas in 1901. In 1915, he was advanced to a titular archbishopric, that of Ptolemais in the Thebaid.

Some Facts about the Foreign Service, a Short Account of Its Organization and Duties Together with Pertinent Laws and Regulations is a seventy-page pamphlet published by the Government Printing Office (Washington 25, D. C. Price 20¢) for the Department of State. This ready information on the foreign service may be of practical use to teachers of history and political science who are called upon to advise young men in the choice of a career.

A postponement has been made in the date of the Colloquium on Luzo-Brazilian Studies to be held at the Library of Congress. The new dates are October 18-21. Plans are rapidly progressing for the meeting. Dr. Lewis Hanke has visited the committees in Brazil and Portugal, and various scholars and learned societies in other parts of Europe to discuss their participation. Those interested in the Colloquium can get information by addressing: The Secretary, Colloquium of Luzo-Brazilian Studies, Library of Congress, Washington 25, D. C.

The subject of the third conference on American history held on February 2 and 3 under the auspices of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania was "Graduate Training Problems in History." A substantially complete report of the proceedings is published in the April number of

the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*. The meeting was held in three panel-sessions. The first presented explanations by four speakers of the methods followed in universities in England, France, Germany, Spain and Portugal for training students in history. The explanations by a scholar familiar with both the American system and that of the country he discussed results in a clearer picture than one usually gets of European educational methods. Some of the reports are not entirely accurate in all their details, but that seems to be unimportant. Lively and long discussion followed these talks. At the second session three university professors of history presented their views on American methods of preparing historians. There was great emphasis on the need of good training for teachers of history. In the third session three deans of graduate schools, historians, considered the suggestions offered during the meeting and indicated some of the problems confronting graduate schools and new procedures being tried by them. The report is well worth reading.

The general topic of the Fifty-Fourth Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences held at Philadelphia, April 14-15, was Point Four: Too Much or Too Little? Speakers from various European countries possessing colonies presented their experiences and discussed their problems. Specialists in various fields and from regions hoping to profit from the carrying out of Point Four offered their advice. There was insistence that the program be worked out without delay. Thomas E. Lynch, Chairman of the Department of Social Science at St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, represented the American Catholic Historical Asssociation at the meeting.

A conference on Modern France, under the sponsorship of the Institute for Advanced Study, Professor E. M. Earle, Chairman, was held at Princeton University from the first to the sixth of February. The conference brought together some sixty historians, political scientists, and observers from the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the French Embassy. The conference was presided over by Professor André Siegfried, who flew from France for the meeting. After his opening lecture, the conference broke up into three panels on political and socio-economic problems. Fifty papers were read, which will appear in book form from the Princeton University Press.

On October 31, 1949, the London *Times* published an article entitled "Catholicism Today" by a special correspondent, on the possibility of "re-examining the relations between Rome and the other Christian bodies." The article occasioned an unprecedented number of letters to the editor, only a portion of which appeared in print. On November 29, the *Times* had another leading article summing up the discussion. Both

articles and the most representative letters are now published by the *Times* in a brochure (Printing House Square, London, price, sixpence). The collection provided a cross-section of contemporary British opinion toward the Catholic Church. Articles on the matter are appearing in English publications, e.g., one by T. S. Gregory in the first number of the *Dublin Review* for this year.

A group of English scholars are launching the *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* to supply the need of a periodical in English entirely devoted to church history and Christian liturgy. It will seek to cover the whole range of those fields—Eastern and Western, Catholic and Protestant, early, mediaeval, and modern. The contributions will be fully documented and will be written in accordance with accepted standards of historical scholarship. They will consist of signed articles, reviews, and surveys of recent publications in Europe and America. Articles on the history of religious thought will appear from time to time, but these will be historical and expository rather than dogmatic. The contributors will be scholars qualified to write with authority in their chosen field, and will be drawn from all communions. The *Journal* is to appear twice a year, each number consisting of 128 pages. Subscribers are invited to write to the publishers: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 24 Russell Square, London, W. C. 1, England. The subscription price is 25s ($3.50) *per annum*. Other correspondence should be directed to the editor: Rev. C. W. Dugmore, The University, Manchester 13, England.

A very enlightening article on the new Hebrew manuscripts found in Palestine appears in the January, February, and March numbers of the *American Ecclesiastical Review*. Written by Edward P. Arbez, S.S., of the Department of Semitics and Egyptian Languages and Literatures of the Catholic University of America, it presents an account of the discovery itself, information on the cave where the manuscripts were found and its contents, and a description of the various manuscripts along with an appreciation of their importance.

The publication of Fascicle LXVI (Cashel-Catulensis) of the *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* brings Volume XI of that very useful reference work to completion. The volume began to appear in 1939. Dom Cappuyns has sixty columns on Cassidorus.

The *Supplément* of the *Dictionnaire de la bible* has reached the end of its Volume IV with the appearance of Fascicle XXIII (Judaisme—Justice et Justification). J. Bonsirven, S.J., contributes 143 columns on the highly important subject: "Judaisme palestinien au temps de Jésus Christ."

Christopher Dawson writes an enthusiastic review article on E. R. Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Berne, 1948) in the *Dublin Review* (First Quarter, 1950).

Mason Wade has been named an interim professor of American history in the Catholic University of America. He will take over classes and the seminar of the late Richard J. Purcell. He is the author of *Margaret Fuller, Whetstone of Genius* (New York, Viking Press, 1940); *The Writings of Margaret Fuller* (New York, Viking Press, 1941); *Francis Parkman, Heroic Historian* (New York, Viking Press, 1942); *The French-Canadian Outlook* (New York, Viking Press, 1946); and *The Journals of Francis Parkman*, 2 Vols. (New York, Harper & Brothers, 1947). Another volume of his on French-Canadian history has recently been accepted for publication. His paper read at the joint session of the American Catholic Historical Association and the American Historical Association appears in this number of the REVIEW.

The Reverend John Tracy Ellis has spent the last two months in Europe on the Holy Year pilgrimage and in research.

Professor Martin R. P. McGuire was sent abroad by the Department of State for a survey of the educational situation in various parts of Europe.

Gerhart B. Ladner, associate professor of history in the University of Notre Dame, has received a Guggenheim Fellowship for 1950-51 to enable him to complete his study of reform in the Middle Ages which he pursued at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton this past year. Aaron Abell, associate professor of history, has received a grant from the Social Science Research Council to enable him to complete his study of the social history of the Catholic Church in the United States from 1865 to 1925. Associate professor William O. Shanahan will be on leave of absence during the fall semester to go to Europe to continue his researches into German religious and political history for the Committee on International Relations, and associate professor M. A. Fitzsimons, who has been in England during the spring and summer for researches connected with this committee, will return for the fall semester. Robert D. Brown has been promoted to assistant professor. L. Leon Bernard of John Carroll University, Cleveland, had been appointed assistant professor in European History at the University of Notre Dame beginning in September, and Mr. Thomas N. Brown has been appointed instructor in American and Irish History beginning in the fall semester. Marshall W. Baldwin, who has been visiting professor of Mediaeval History at Notre Dame during the year 1949-50, will return to New York University in September.

Father Angel Custodio Vega, distinguished Augustinian of Escorial, has been named a member of the Real Academia de la Historia. He will resign in his duties as editor of *La ciudad de Dios* to take over the continuation of *España sagrada* for the Academia.

Etienne Gilson, professor at the Collège de France, was invited to Sweden this spring to lecture on Christian philosophy at the Universities of Lund, Upsala, and Stockholm.

Antonio Ballesteros y Beretta, versatile Spanish professor of history and member of the Real Academia de la Historia since 1917, died last year at the age of sixty-nine. His *Historia de España* in nine volumes is a monumental work. He worked both in Spanish and Hispanic American history. *Cuestiones históricas* was an early Spanish adaptation of Bernheim in which he collaborated.

The distinguished historical scholar, Joseph de Ghellinck d'Elseghem, S.J., died on January 4 at the age of seventy-eight. Born at Gand of distinguished parentage, he was educated by the Jesuits and entered the Society at the age of seventeen. His scholarly formation was acquired entirely within the circle of the Society, the theological difficulties of the times making it inadvisable for him to attend a university. A sojourn with the Bollandists did much to prepare him for historical research. Most of his career was spent at the Jesuit scholasticate at Louvain in teaching patrology and the history of dogma. His learned writings, beginning with an article in the *American Quarterly Review* (!) entitled: "Mediaeval Theology. A Few Notes on Its Early History," stayed in these two fields. His chief works were the lengthy articles, "L'Eucharistie au XII^e siècle en occident" and "Pierre Lombard" in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique;* his volume on *Le mouvement théologique du XII siècle* (greatly revised edition in 1948); a contribution to the volume, *Pour l'histoire du mot sacramentum: I. Les anténicéens;* his two small but precious volumes, *Littérature latine au moyen âge,* reaching down to St. Anselm; his two-volume brilliant work, *L'essor de la littérature latine au XII^e siècle,* and his three volumes of *Patristique et moyen âge.* It seems probable that a fourth volume of this last work will appear, its subject matter, mediaeval Latin.

Much of the material for his books was prepared in articles that Père de Ghellinck contributed to various learned periodicals. Especially his articles, reviews, and bibliographical contributions in the Jesuit *Nouvelle revue théologique* of Louvain represented prodigious efforts. But he also collaborated with the work of scholars outside his community. In this spirit he was a founder and tower of strength of the now monumental series, Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense.

Plans for two volumes of *Mélanges de Ghellinck* got under way in 1949. It is to be regretted that his friends did not have the pleasure of putting the completed tribute into his hands. Father de Ghellinck's inspiration will long sustain scholarship in the fields in which he was a master. His little work, *Les exercises pratiques du séminaire en théologie,* has already had its influence—witness its four editions in ten years. Young scholars will continue to be formed by it and in the school of his writings.

Robert Fawtier, authority on the life of St. Catherine of Siena, died during the winter. He visited the United States last year on behalf of the International Historical Congress to be held in Paris this fall and was charged with arrangements for the congress. He had taught in England for a time and spoke English fluently.

The Most Reverend John Timothy McNicholas, O.P., Archbishop of Cincinnati, died on April 22 at the age of seventy-two. He was a life member of the American Catholic Historical Association. Irish by birth, he was brought to the United States as a child, his family settling at Chester, Pennsylvania. At the age of seventeen he entered the Order of Preachers. Both in his order and later in the hierarchy he showd unusual ability in planning and directing projects of wide scope in various fields. He became Bishop of Duluth in 1918 and Archbishop of Cincinnati in 1925. Outstanding among his activities were his administrative work in the National Catholic Welfare Conference, his services as trustee of the Catholic University of America, as president of the National Catholic Educational Association, and as founder and patron of the scientific Institutum Divi Thomae. The Archbishop spoke and wrote wisely and fearlessly on social problems that demanded his attention as a leader in Catholic thought. His voice and gracious personality will long be missed.

The Most Reverend Gerald Shaughnessy, S.M., fourth Bishop of Seattle, died on May 17, just before his sixty-third birthday. He had been named to the see in 1933. A graduate of Boston College in 1909, he taught in private and public schools until 1916, when he entered the Marists. After his ordination in 1920 he took his doctorate in history at the Catholic University of America. His well-known dissertation, written under the direction of the late Monsignor Peter Guilday, was entitled, *Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?* It was published by Macmillan. For several years he divided his time between teaching duties at Marist College and work on the staff of the Apostolic Delegation in Washington, D. C.

May 1, 1950 was the hundredth anniversary of the wedding of Ellen Ewing and William Tecumseh Sherman in Washington, D. C., and descendants of General Sherman gathered in Washington to celebrate the

centennial. The wedding of the daughter of Senator Thomas Ewing to the young army officer took place in the Blair House before Father James Ryder, the President of Georgetown University. Among the distinguished guests were President Zachary Taylor, the members of the Cabinet, the English Ambassador, Sir Henry Bulwer, Daniel Webster, Thomas Benton, and Henry Clay.

Documents:

The Goshenhoppen Registers. Trans. and ed. by John R. Dunne, O.S.A. (*Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia,* Mar.).—En torno a un centenario: Seis cartas de Fr. Junípero Serra. Fidel de Lejarza, O.F.M. (*Archivo Ibero-Americano,* Oct. 1949).—Reply of Mission San Carlos Borromeo to the Questionnaire of the Spanish Government in 1812 concerning the Native Culture of the California Mission Indians. Maynard Geiger (Ed.) (*Americas,* Apr.).—Ynstrución para el govierno de las Felipinas y de como los an de regir y governar aquella gente. Miguel de Benavides, O.P. Transcripción y notas de Jesús Gayo, O.P. (*Unitas,* Jan.).

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

Some Observations on Contemporary Historical Theory. Chester McArthur Destler (*American Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).

Valores humanísticos de la historia de la ciencia. Paul F. Schurmann (*Revista de la Universidad de Buenos Aires*, Jan.).

Political Science, Mid-Century. Leonard D. White (*Jrn. of Politics*, Feb.).

Note paleografiche. Singula littera: Le origini sacrali dell'abbreviazioni per sigla. A. R. Natale (*Aevum*, Jan.).

Un tratado sobre los nombres divinos en un manuscrito de Córdoba. Jean Leclercq (*Hispania sacra*, July, 1949).

Les catalogues de manuscrits, premier supplément aux listes de Weinberger et de Richardson. M. Cappuyns and H. Bascour (*Scriptorium*, Vol. III, 1949, Fasc. 2).

Western Manuscripts. A Bibliography of Publications in Great Britain, 1946-1948. G. R. C. Davis (*ibid.*).

Règle du Maitre, statistiques et manuscrits. H. Vanderhoven (*ibid.*).

Le sens catholique du travail et de la civilisation. André de Bovis, S.I. (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Apr.).

Los tratados de paz injustos. Pelayo de Zamayón (*Estudios Franciscanos*, Jan.).

Early Man and the Threshold of Religion. Dorothy A. E. Garrod (*Month*, Mar.).

I manoscritti ebraici scoperti nel deserto di Giuda. A. Bea, S.I. (*La civiltà cattolica*, Mar. 4).

Autenticità e data dei manoscritti ebraici scoperti nel deserto di Giuda. A. Bea, S. I. (*ibid.*, Mar. 18).

Il Papato e la cultura intellettuale. A. Oddone, S.I. (*ibid.*, Apr. 1).

La seconde génération chrétienne. M. Goguel (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, Oct.).

The Future of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Robert M. Grant (*Jrn. of Religion*, Apr.).

Les origines chrétiennes d'après l'oeuvre de Maurice Goguel. Marcel Simon (*Revue historique*, Oct.).

Le commerce de l'argent au moyen âge. Y. Renouard (*ibid.*, Jan.).

The Present Relevance of the Patristic Age. F. L. Cross (*Church Quart. Rev.*, Jan.).

Nature in Early and Mediaeval Christian Thought. J. N. Langmead Casserley (*ibid.*).

Il nuovo Sabatier. A. Vaccari (*Biblica*, Vol. 31, Fasc. 1).

L'Affaire Nestorius vue de Rome (suite). E. Amann (*Revue des sciences religieuses*, Jan.).

Ab his qui sunt undique dans saint Irénée. R. Jacquin (*ibid.*).

Chronique d'exégèse et de théologie biblique. La résurrection. J. Schmitt (*ibid.*).

Chronique d'histoire des religions. A. Vincent (*ibid.*).

Bulletin d'histoire de la philosophie médiévale. J. Isaac (*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, Oct.).

Un inédit de Scot Erigène. H. F. Dondaine (*ibid.*, Jan.).

A propos du *Liber tertius* du *De bestiis et aliis rebus* et d'un passage des *Etymologiae* d'Isidore de Séville. H. Silvestre (*Le moyen âge*, No. 3-4, 1949).

Gregory VII and Modern Scholars. Aubrey Gwynn (*Studies*, Mar.).

La signification théologique du pontificat de Grégoire VII. H. X. Arquillière (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, Apr.).

The Genesis of the Crusades. The Encyclical of Sergius IV (1009-1012). Alexander Gieysztor (*Medievalia et humanistica*, Fasc. VI).

Onulf of Speyer. A Humanist of the Eleventh Century. Luitpold Wallach (*ibid.*).
The Lords of Bethsan in the Kingdoms of Jerusalem and Cyprus. John L. La Monte and Norton Downs III (*ibid.*).
The Quest for Biographical Evidence in *Perceval*. Raphael Levy (*ibid.*).
Serfs et "colliberti" (XI°-XII° siècles). J. Boussard (*Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 1948, No. 2).
Les registres d'Innocent III. Georges Tessier (*ibid.*).
Une adaptation du *De officiis* au XII° siècle: La doctrine du *Moralium dogma philosophorum*. Ph. Delhaye (*Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, Jan.).
L'auteur de la Somme *Quoniam homines*. P. Glorieux (*ibid.*).
John of Cornwall. A Brief Biography. E. Rathbond (*ibid.*).
Hugues de Saint-Victor, source du Pseudo-Étienne Langton. D. Van den Eynde, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).
Les Gloses sur le IV° livre des Sentences du manuscrit *Paris Nat. Lat. 3032*. H. F. Dondaine, O.P. (*ibid.*).
Le traité des passions chez saint Albert le Grand. P. Michaud Quantin (*ibid.*).
Saint Thomas et l'accroissement de la béatitude (étude sur la Somme, I^{a}, II^{ae}, q. 4, a. 5, ad. 5). P. Glorieux (*ibid.*).
A Scottish Master at Paris: Master Adam de Gulyne. G. W. S. Barrow (*ibid.*).
A propos de la date de certains commentaires sur l'Éthique. Q. Lottin (*ibid.*).
S. Agostino e S. Tommaso. Amato Masnovo (*Salesianum*, Oct.).
Per la storia e la cronologia di S. Bonaventura, O. Min. (c. 1217-1274). P. Giuseppe Abate, O.F.M.Conv. (*Miscellanea Francescana*, Oct. and Jan.).
Opere giovanili di S. Bernardino da Siena. Studio sui codici autografi. Giovanni Pollicini (*ibid.*).
Per un commento a Iacopone da Todi. Franca Ageno (*Convivium*, No. 1, 1950).
Paolo Diacono e la poesia. Gustavo Vinay (*ibid.*).
Cristianesimo antico e riforma ortodossa. Note intorno al "Pastore" di Erma. Serafina Prete (*ibid.*).
The Connection of Virtues according to Ockham. Othmar Suk, O.F.M. (*Franciscan Studies*, Mar.).
On the Attribution of the Tractatus de Sacramento Altaris to Stephen of Bauge. Damian Van den Eynde, O.F.M. (*ibid.*)
A Terminus Ante Quem for the Commentary of Alexander of Hales. Kilian F. Lynch, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).
Manuscripts of *Le Noie* by Antonio Pucci. Kenneth McKenzi (*Speculum*, Apr.).
Heinrich von Oyta and Biblical Criticism in the Fourteenth Century. Frank Rosenthal (*ibid.*).
Genoese Jews in the Thirteenth Century. Cecil Roth (*ibid.*).
Vacca in Lucanum. Berthe M. Marti (*ibid.*).
De Civitate Dei, XV, 2, and Augustine's Idea of the Christian Society. F. Edward Cranz (*ibid.*).
Peiresc's Provençal Manuscripts. Francis W. Gravit (*ibid.*).
Another Provençal Manuscript in the Pierpont Morgan Library. Curt F. Bühler (*ibid.*).
Clément Marot and Popular Songs. Marcel Françon (*ibid.*).
Recent Literature of the Renaissance. A Bibliography. (*Studies in Philology*, Apr.).
The Education of the Aristocracy in the Renaissance. J. H. Hexter (*Jrn. of Modern Hist.*, Mar.).
Erasme et la crise de l'unité chrétienne au XVI° siècle. J. Lecler, S.I., (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Mar.).
Rivendicazione di Vico. G. Soleri (*Revista di filosofia neo-scolastica*, Jan.).
Cardinal Consalvi—"Ego et Rex Meus." J. O'Rourke, P. P. (*Irish Eccles. Rec.*, Feb.).
The Sacrament of Penance in Tertullian—V. C. B. Daly (*ibid.*).
The First Holy Year. Professor McBride (*ibid.*, Mar.).
The Nature of Nationalism. James O'Connell (*ibid.*, Apr.).

The Church and Communism in China. Raymond Joseph de Jaegher (*ibid.*).
The Bernardine Biographers. Stanley St. Clair Morrison (*ibid.*).
Die altisländischen Sólarljód. Ernst Krens (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft—Nouvelle revue de science missionnaire*, Jan.).
Lo Scisma del Patroado nel Ceylon. D. Beda Barcatta, Silv. O.S.B. (*ibid.*).
Die Hospitäler St. Joseph und St. Anna der Franziskaner in Mikayo im Dienste der Glaubensverbreitung. P. Dorotheus Schilling, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).
L'organisation internationale du travail et les problèmes sociaux en pays de mission. E. Beupin (*ibid.*).
The Jerusalem Problem. A Note on Legality. C. Rackauskas (*Thought*, Mar.).

EUROPEAN

Observations sur la localisation du *Capitulare de Villis*. François L. Ganshof (*Le moyen âge*, No. 3-4, 1949).
Girart, comte de Vienne. L. Levillain (*ibid.*).
Chilpéric et Tournai. P. Rolland (*ibid.*).
L'Ordre de la Jarretière et l'Ordre de l'Étoile. Y. Renouard (*ibid.*).
Les relations politiques entre la France et l'Italie, principalement au XIV^e^ et dans la première moitié du XV^e^ siècle. G. Peyronnet (*ibid.*).
La crise d'une société durant la guerre de Cent Ans. R. Fawtier (*Revue historique*, Jan.).
Le concile de Bordeaux de 1624. Recherches sur la tradition pastorale en France après le concile de Trente. Paul Broutin, S.I. (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Apr.).
Louis XIV et le droit d'élection dans les monastères des Clarisses Urbanistes. R. Bocquet (P. Agathange) (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, Jan.).
Marie Antoinette. G. P. Gooch (*Hist.*, Oct.).
Louis Veuillot and the February Revolution. Thomas P. Neill (*Histor. Bulletin*, May).
Sobre la autobiografía de San Valerio y su ascetismo. Justo Fernández (*Hispania sacra*, July, 1949).
Los cuestores en España y la regalía de indulgencias. José Goñi Gaztambide (*ibid.*).
Venida de Ínigo de Loyola a Pamplona. Antonio Pérez Goyena, S.I. (*ibid.*).
Calendarios hispánicos anteriores al siglo XIII. José Vives y Angel Fábrega (*ibid.*)
Dos códices visigóticos de la Catedral de Burgos. Demetrío Mansilla (*ibid.*).
Un fragmento de sacramentario inédito del museo episcopal de Vich. Alexandre M. Olivar (*ibid.*).
Catálogo del Archivo del Real Seminario mayor de San Carlos, de Salamanca. Luis Sala Balust (*ibid.*).
Manuscritos hispánicos en Bibliotecas extranjeras. José Vives (*ibid.*).
Bulletin de liturgie mozarabe. Louis Brou (*ibid.*).
El imperio hispánico y los cinco reinos. Ramón Menéndez Pidal (*Revista de estudios políticos*, Jan.).
Rusia, heredera de Bizancio. Arnold Toynbee (*ibid.*).
Lectura política de Quevedo. José Luis Aranguren (*ibid.*).
Un nuevo manuscrito con versiones catalanas de Arnau de Vilanova. Martín de Riquer (*Analecta sacra Tarraconensia*, Jan.).
La Crónica de Fr. Pedro Marsili y la *Vita Anonymi* de S. Ramón de Penyafort. José M.ª Coll, O.P. (*ibid.*).
Un nuevo testimonio del *Corpus de Sang*. Miguel Batllori, S.I. (*ibid.*).
Nuevos documentos para la biografía de Jaime Balmes. José M.ª Madurell Marimón (*ibid.*).
La dedicación de la iglesia de Santa Maria de Mérida. José Vives (*ibid.*).
Los manuscritos patrísticos y litúrgicos latinos de la Universidad de Salamanca. Alexandre M.ª Olivar (*ibid.*).
Manuscrito denominado "Libro de Calzada" existente en al Archivo capitular de la catedral de Gerona. Angeles Masía (*ibid.*).

La catedral de Barcelona en la monarquía Borbónica. Rafael Oliver Bertrand (*ibid.*)

Ramón Lull y Luis Vives: homologias bibliográficas. Fermín de Urmenta (*Estudios Franciscanos,* Jan.).

La casa de Cardona y sus obras en Poblet. César Martinell (*Estudios históricos y documentos de los Archivos de Protocolos,* Vol. II, 1950).

Notas para unos prolegómenos a la historia del notariado español (tiempos anteriores a la Reconquista). Honorio García (*ibid.*).

El precario y la precaria (notas para la historia de la enfiteusis). Raimundo Noguera de Guzmán (*ibid.*).

Reminiscencias feudales en un capbreu del siglo XVII. Sebastián Parés (*ibid.*).

De una escribanía rural (siglos XIV, XV y XVI). José Maurí Serra (*ibid.*).

La expulsión de los judíos del reino de Nápoles. Felipe Ruiz Martín (*Hispania,* Apr., 1949).

Filiberto de Chalon, Príncipe de Orange. Sus dos estancias en España (1520 y 1522-1524). Amada López de Meneses (*ibid.*).

El sentimiento de Europa en la España del XVII. José M.ª Jover (*ibid.*).

Ordenanzas de la seda. Granada, año de 1515. Luis Pérez Bueno (*ibid.*).

La incorporación de Cádiz a la Corona de Castilla bajo Alfonso X. Hipólito Sancho de Sopranis (*ibid.,* July, 1949).

Francisco de Vitoria, del linaje de los Arcayas de Vitoria-Alava. Joaquín Iriarte, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Fray Luis de Granado en Escalaceli. Nuevos datos para el conocimiento histórico y espiritual de su vida. Alvaro Huerga, O.P. (*ibid.*).

Dos artistas en la Catedral de Málaga. P. Andres Llordén (*La ciudad de Dios,* Sept., 1949).

Bulletins Historiques: L'Espagne sous les Rois Catholiques et les Habsbourg (1474-1700). H. Lapeyre (*Revue historique,* Jan.).

Ideas Políticas de Sor María de Agreda. Antonio González, O.P. (*Unitas,* Jan.).

Monasteri e riforma a Milano (dalla fine del sec. X. agli inizi del sec. XII). Zerbi Piero (*Aevum,* Jan.).

Deux centres artistiques: Venise et Urbin. A. Chastel (*Bibliothèque d'humanisme et renaissance,* Vol. 12, No. 2).

Articles on St. Lawrence of Brindisi by various authors. (*Round Table of Franciscan Research,* Apr.).

Il Ven. P. Alberto Leoni Carmelitano (1563-1642) e la "Casa dei Pazzerelli" in Firenze. Marianus Luit, O.Carm. (*Analecta Ordinis carmelitarum,* Vol. XIV, 1949, Fasc. II).

De P. Wandelino Zink, O.Carm., Missionario in Stralsund (mort. 1840). Gundeker Hatzold, O.Carm. (*ibid.*).

Origini e antichità della Provincia Toscana dei Carmelitani. Andreas Sabatini, O.Carm. (*ibid.*).

Le Carmel en Arvor. Henri Jouin-Dubois (*ibid.*).

I cattolici di fronte all'insurrezione greca (1821-1829). G. Hofmann, S.I. (*La civiltà cattolica,* Jan.).

Iugoslavia. Un anno di persecuzione religiosa. Special correspondent (*ibid.,* Mar. 4).

Romania. Inasprimento della persecuzione religiosa. Special correspondent (*ibid.,* Mar. 18).

Caratteristiche della lotta contro la chiesa in Cecoslovacchia. F. Cavalli, S.I. (*ibid.,* Apr. 15).

Polonia. La soppressione della Caritas e la persecuzione religiosa. Special correspondent (*ibid.*).

Piedmont and Prussia: The Influence of the Campaigns of 1848-1849 on the Constitutional Development of Italy. Howard McGaw Smyth (*American Histor. Rev.,* Apr.).

Civil Liberties in Germany. Bennett M. Rich (*Political Science Quart.,* Mar.).

Czechoslovakia: A Study in Disintegration. Bohdan Chudoba (*Thought,* Mar.).

A Polish-Czechoslovak Confederation. Eduard Taborsky (*Jrn. of Central European Affairs,* Jan.).

The Soviet Ultimatum to Romania (26 June, 1940). Alexander Cretzianu (*ibid.*).
James Appleton's Mission to Naples (1825-1826). Howard R. Marraro (*ibid.*).
The Story of Michael Shipkov's Detention and Interrogation by the Bulgarian Militia (*Department of State Bulletin*, Mar. 13).
The Theory and Practice of Soviet Federalism. Vernon V. Aspaturian (*Jrn. of Politics*, Feb.).
Marx and Russian Revolutionaires. W. Weintraub (*Cambridge Jrn.*, May).
European Recovery: The Longer View. J. K. Galbraith (*Rev. of Politics*, Apr.).
The Consequences of the Currency Reform in Western Germany. Heinz Sauermann (*ibid.*).
The Political Theory of the New Democratic Constitutions. C. J. Friedrich (*ibid.*)
On the Origins of the Autonomous Russian Church. Elie Denissoff (*ibid.*).

BRITISH EMPIRE

Democracy in Great Britain. Carl F. Brand (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*, May).
Local History: The Present Position and Its Possibilities. E. F. Jacob (*Hist.*, Oct.).
The Friars of the Holy Cross in England. H. F. Chettle (*ibid.*).
The Anglo-Norman Franchises. Part II. Naomi D. Hurnard (*English Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).
Le Psautier de Peterborough et ses miniatures profanes empruntées au roman de Philippe de Beaumanoir, *Jehan et Blonde*. Louis Carolus-Barré (*Romania*, No. 281).
An Unnoticed *Questio theologica* of Walter Burley. S. Harrison Thomson (*Medievalia et humanistica*, Fasc. VI).
Sir John Hackett, Henry VIII's Ambassador in Malines. Elizabeth Frances Rogers (*ibid.*).
Education of Professional Musicians in Elizabethan England. Walter L. Woodfill (*ibid.*).
The Chronicles of Jocelin for Teachers. Lowrie J. Daly (*Histor. Bulletin*, May).
Early Tudor Historiography, 1485-1548. William R. Trimble (*Jrn. of the Hist. of Ideas*, Jan.).
Milton and the Art of History: A Study of Two Influences on *A Brief History of Moscovia*. Joseph Allen Bryant, Jr. (*Philological Quart.*, Jan.).
Conventus Aylesfordiensis recuperatus. Joachim Smet, O.Carm. (*Analecta Ordinis Carmelitarum*, Vol. XIV, Fasc. II, 1949).
British Labour in Search of a Socialist Foreign Policy. M. A. Fitzsimons (*Rev. of Politics*, Apr.).
Le texte de la Bible en Irlande du V^e^ au IX^e^ siècle. A. Cordoliani (*Revue biblique*, Jan.).
Insular Paleography, Present State and Problems. L. Bieler (*Scriptorium*, Vol. III, 1949, Fasc. 2).
Manuscript Studies in Ireland, 1946 to 1948. L. Bieler (*ibid.*).
A Study of the Latin Manuscripts of the *Navigatio Sancti Brendani*. C. Selmer (*ibid.*).
Sidelights on the Chronology of St. Patrick. Ludwig Bieler (*Irish Histor. Studies*, Sept.).
The Request of the Irish for English Law, 1277-80. Jocelyn Otway-Ruthven (*ibid.*)
Writings on Irish History, 1948. Patrick Henchy and F. X. Martin, O.S.A. (*ibid.*)
The Migration of the Ciarraige. Vernam Hull (*Speculum*, Apr.).
'Pilates Voys.' Roscoe E. Parker (*ibid.*).
The Native Irish and English Law in Medieval Ireland. Jocelyn Otway-Ruthven (*Irish Histor. Studies*, Mar.).
The Irish Record Commission, 1810-30. Margaret Griffith (*ibid.*).
The Vindication of the Earl of Kildare from Treason, 1496. G. O .Sayles (*ibid.*).

Surveys of Ireland in the Seventeenth Century. P. J. McLaughlin (*Irish Eccles. Rec.*, Feb.).
The Cill or Cillin: A Study in Early Irish Ecclesiology. P. Canon Power (*ibid.*, Mar.).
Medieval Ireland in Cistercian Records. John Hennig (*ibid.*).
The Real Bishop Bonner. Michael O'Halloran (*ibid.*, Apr.).
Bishop Joseph Brown, O.S.B. Basil Hemphill (*Studies*, Mar.).
Historic Galway Convents: Part II. Helena Concannon (*ibid.*).
Was John Keogh an Informer? Francis Finegan (*ibid.*).
Origins of Irish Nationalism. Diarmuid Murtagh (*ibid.*).
Kevin Izod O'Doherty in Australia. Roger Wynne (*Australasian Cath. Rec.*, Jan.).
Bishop Willson, II. John H. Cullen (*ibid.*).

AMERICAN

Report of the Third Conference of American History Held Under the Auspices of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, February 2 and 3, 1950 (*Pennsylvania Mag.*, Apr.).
Justices Black and Frankfurter: Supreme Court Majority and Minority Trends. Wallace Mendelson (*Jrn. of Politics*, Feb.).
Perry Hall: County Seat of the Gough and Carroll Families. Rossiter Bevan (*Maryland Histor. Society*, Mar.).
A Jesuit in the War against the Northern Indians. R. Ignatius Burns, S.J. (*Records of the American Catholic Histor. Society of Philadelphia*, Mar.).
John Adams Flays a Philosophe: Annotations on Condorcet's *Progress of the Human Mind*. Zoltan Haraszti (*William and Mary Quart.*, Apr.).
New Considerations on the Mission of Robert Dale Owen to the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, 1853-1858. Sexson E. Humphreys (*Indiana Mag. of Hist.*, Mar.).
Encouragement of Immigration to the Middle West during the Era of the Civil War. Maurice G. Baxter (*ibid.*).
The Red Man's Retreat from Northern Indiana. Leon M. Gordon II (*ibid.*).
Conscientious Objectors in Indiana during World War II. Charles B. Hirsch (*ibid.*)
The Missouri Reader: Ownership of the Land under France, Spain, and United States. Ada Paris Klein (ed.) (*Missouri Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).
J. K. Paulding's Sketch of the Great Lakes. Mentor L. Williams (*Mid-America*, Apr.).
The Theatre in Early Kansas City. Harold E. and Ernestine Briggs (*ibid.*).
Morales Writes a Letter to Melgarejo. Harvey L. Johnson (*ibid.*).
The Slovenians, Most Recent American Immigrants. Marie Prisland (*Wisconsin Mag. of Hist.*, Mar.).
The American Party, 1886-1891. John Higham (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*, Feb.).
Changes in the Statue of Negroes in Arkansas, 1948-50. A Stephen Stephan (*Arkansas Histor. Quart.*, Spring, 1950).
Earliest Catholic Footprints in Minnesota. James M. Reardon (*Report of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association*, 1949).
A Short Historical Summary of the Ukranian Catholics in Canada. Andrew Roborecky (*ibid.*).
St. Peter's Abbey, 1903-1921. Jerome Weber, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).
La Vérendrye and His Work of Discovery. Antoine d'Eschambault (*ibid.*).
Then and Now in Alberta's Education. John S. Cormack (*ibid.*).
The Macdonnel Family in the West. Vincent Jensen, S.J. (*ibid.*).
Monseigneur Alexandre Taché, o.m.i., organisateur de l'Église Catholique dans l'ouest Canadien. Joseph Champagne, o.m.i. (*ibid.*).
Le Père Joseph Hugonard, o.m.i.: Son oeuvre apostolique. Irénée Tourigny, o.m.i. (*ibid.*).
L'Éducation à la Rivière Rouge (1844-1870): Les Soeurs Grises. Sister Élisabeth de Moissac, s.g.m. (*ibid.*).

Le sénateur Girard. Marius Benoist (*ibid.*).
Le projet de mission du P. Aulneau chez les Mandanes. Paul Desjardins, s.j. (*ibid.*)
Les pionniers du Collège de Saint-Boniface. Alfred Bernier, s.j. (*ibid.*).
La rebéllion de la Rivière-Rouge. Guillaume-L. Charette (*ibid.*).
An Historical Sidelight: Quebec 1658. A. J. MacDougall, S.J. (*Culture*, Mar.).
France and Louisiana in the Early Eighteenth Century. Marcel Giraud (*Mississippi Valley Histor. Rev.*, Mar.).
La "république canadienne" de 1838. Victor Morin (*Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique Française*, Mar.).
Montréal et Louisiane. Olivier Mauralt (*ibid.*).
Itinéraire spirituel de Marguerite Bourgeoys (3e et dernier article). Yvon Charon, p.s.s. (*ibid.*).
Une maison d'éducation à Saint-Dominique. Gabriel Debien (*ibid.*).
Le Révérend Père Jacques Marquette, s.j., était-il prêtre? Jean Delanglez, s.j. (*ibid.*).
Pathology of Democracy in Latin America: A Symposium. W. W. Pierson (Ed.) (*American Political Science Rev.*, Mar.).
A Historian's Point of View. Arthur P. Whitaker (*ibid.*).
A Political Scientist's Point of View. Russell Fitzgibbon (*ibid.*).
An Economist's Point of View. Sanford A. Mosk (*ibid.*).
Discussion: A Sociologist's Point of View. W. Rex Crawford (*ibid.*).
Fray Junípero Serra and Spain. Juan Hervás (*Americas*, Jan.).
Fray Junípero Serra and His Apostolate in Mexico. Rafael Heliodoro Valle (*ibid.*).
Junípero Serra, O.F.M., in the Light of Chronology and Geography (1713-1784). Maynard Geiger (*ibid.*).
Educational Methods of the Franciscans in Spanish California. Daniel D. McGarry (*ibid.*).
Early Diplomatic Relations between Mexico and the Far East. Clinton Harvey Gardiner (*ibid.*, Apr.).
Forgotten Bastions along the Spanish Main: Campeche. Jean Bassford von Winning (*ibid.*).
Writings on United States Catholic History, 1949. A Selective Bibliography. Thomas F. O'Connor (*ibid.*).
The Commission on History of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History. Silvio Zavala (*ibid.*).
The Age of the Caudillos. John Francis Bannon (*Histor. Bulletin*, May).
O ano de 1549 na história do Brasil e da Companhia de Jesus. Armando Cardoso, S.J. (*Verbum*, Dec.).
No IV centenário da chegada à Bahia do fundador de São Paulo. Tito Lívio Ferreira (*ibid.*).
Political Aspects of the Paraguayan Revolution, 1936-1940. Harris Gaylord Warren (*Hispanic American Histor. Rev.*, Feb.).
The Building of the Mexican Railway. David M. Pletcher (*ibid.*).
The Track of the Columbus Caravels in 1492. William Herbert Hobbs (*ibid.*).
Latin American Archivology, 1948-1949. Roscoe R. Hill (*ibid.*).
Algunos aspectos de la obra de Oviedo. Ernesto Chinchilla Aguilar (*Revista de historia de America*, Dec.).
Fray Jerónimo de Mendieta, pensador político e historiador. Luis González Cárdenas (*ibid.*).
Ensayo bibliográfico sobre San Francisco Solano. Alejandro Recio (*Archivo Ibero-Americano*, Oct.).
Romanticismo y sociedades secretas. Jamil Almansur Haddad (*Revista de la Universidad de Buenos Aires*, Apr., 1949).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Acomb, Frances. *Anglophobia in France, 1763-1789.* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1950. Pp. xii, 167. $4.50.)

Agar, Herbert. *The Price of Union.* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1950. Pp. xviii, 750. $5.00.)

Almond, Gabriel A. *The American People and Foreign Policy.* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1950. Pp. x, 269. $3.75.)

Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1949 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950. Pp. 234.)

Athanasius, Saint. *The Life of Saint Antony.* Translated by Robert T. Meyer. (Westminster: Newman Press, 1950. Pp. 154. $2.50.)

Auffray, A. *Un saint de moins de quinze ans.* (Lyon, France: Emmanuel Vitte, 1950. Pp. 232. 240 fr.)

Bailey, Thomas A. *A Diplomatic History of the American People.* 4th edition. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1950. Pp. xxviii, 986. $5.00.)

Baltzly, Alexander and A. William Salomone. (Eds.). *Readings in Twentieth-Century European History.* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1950. Pp. xxv, 610. $5.00.)

Bane, Martin J., S.M.A. *The Catholic Story of Liberia.* (New York: Declan X. McMullen Co., Inc., 1950. Pp. 163. $2.50.)

Beazley, C. Raymond. *The Dawn of Modern Geography.* 3 Volumes. (New York: Peter Smith, 1950. Pp. xvi, 538; xix, 651; xvi, 638. $35.00 for three volumes.)

Beckett, Sir W. Eric. *The North Atlantic Treaty, the Brussels Treaty and the Charter of the United Nations.* (London: Stevens and Sons, Ltd., for the London Institute of World Affairs, 1950. Pp. viii, 75. 10s. 6d.)

Bemis, Samuel Flagg. *A Diplomatic History of the United States.* 3rd edition. (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1950. Pp. xii, 994. $5.75.)

Bender, Harold S. *Conrad Grebel c. 1498-1526. The Founder of the Swiss Brethren.* Volume Six of the *Studies in Mennonite and Anabaptist History.* (Goshen, Indiana: Mennonite Historical Society, 1950. Pp. xvi, 326. $3.50.)

Bernard, William S., Carolyn Zeleny, and Henry Miller (Eds.). *American Immigration Policy. A Reappraisal.* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1950. Pp. xx, 341. $4.00.)

Beuken, J. H. A. *De Hanze en Vlaanderen.* (Maastricht: Ernest Van Aelst, 1950. Pp. 205.)

Black, C. E., and E. C. Helmreich. *Twentieth Century Europe. A History.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1950. Pp. xxiii, 910, xviii. Trade Price $7.50; Text Price $5.50.) In sumptuous format (at least in the trade edition), elegantly printed and well illustrated with photographs, this stout volume represents a great effort to give facts calmly, undramatically, and without subjective interpretation. Its thirty-two chapters, broken up by many headings, are focused on Europe, but the peoples of other continents are not slighted when they enter into the drama of world history. Both authors are experts on Eastern Europe. The Vatican and its policies as well as the status and activities of the Catholic Church throughout the world receive at least brief treatments in various parts of the volume. There are many maps, nine appendices of lists, documents and chronology, forty-three pages of closely printed bibliography, and a careful index. Any teacher who is choosing a textbook for the period should examine this work, and a general reader will find it interesting.

Boyd, Julian P. (Ed.), Lyman H. Butterfield and Mina R. Bryan (Assoc. Eds.). *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson.* Volume I. *1760-1776.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. lviii, 679. $10.00.)

Bracke, William B. *Wheat Country.* (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, Inc., 1950. Pp. viii, 309. $3.50.)

Brinton, Crane. *English Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950. Pp. vii, 312. $3.50.)

Brown, George W. (Ed.). *Canada.* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950. Pp. xviii, 621. $6.50.)

Butler, Ruth Lapham. *Guide to the Hispanic American Historical Review, 1918-1945.* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1950. Pp. xviii, 251. $6.00.)

Canadian Catholic Historical Association Report of 1949. La Société Canadienne d'Histoire de l'Eglise Catholique Report 1948-49. (In one volume.) (Ottawa: Canadian Catholic Historical Association, 1950. Pp. 82; 105.)

Chamberlain, Robert S. *Francisco Morázan, Champion of Central American Federation.* (Coral Gables: University of Miami Hispanic-American Studies, 1950. Pp. 58.)

Claudel, Paul. *The Eye Listens.* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Pp. ix., 293. $5.00.)

Clercq, Charles de. *Histoire des conciles.* Volume XI. *Conciles des orientaux catholiques.* (Paris: Librairie Letouzey at Ané, 1949. Pp. xii, 492. 1300 fr.)

Combes, Gustave. *Revival of Paganism.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950. Pp. v, 360. $4.50.)

Commager, Henry Steele. *The American Mind.* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950. Pp. ix, 476. $5.00.)

Committee of Management. *The John Carter Brown Library Annual Report, 1948-1949.* (Providence: Brown University Press, 1949. Pp. 67.)

Conant, Kenneth John. *Benedictine Contributions to Church Architecture.* (Latrobe: Archabbey Press, 1949. Pp. xiii, 63. $2.25.)

Coulson, Thomas. *Joseph Henry, His Life and Work.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. 352. $5.00.)

Davidson, Gustav (Ed. and compiler). *In Fealty to Apollo. Poetry Society of America 1910-1950.* (New York: Fine Editions Press, 1950. Pp. 64. $2.50.)

Dean, Vera Micheles. *Europe and the United States.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1950. Pp. ix, 349, xiii. $3.50.)

Dennett, Raymond and Robert K. Turner (Eds.). *Documents on American Foreign Relations.* Volume X. *1948.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press for the World Peace Foundation, 1950. Pp. xxvi, 705. $6.00.)

Department of State. *Germany 1947-1949. The Story in Documents.* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950. Pp. xlvi, 631. $3.25.)

Dix, John A. and Leicester C. Lewis (Eds.). *A History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York.* Volume V. *The Rectorship of Dr. Morgan Dix.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950. Pp. xii, 316. $5.00.)

Drury, Clifford M. *The History of the Chaplain Corps of the United States Navy.* Volume I. *1778-1939.* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1949. Pp. xii, 237.)

Dulles, John Foster. *War or Peace.* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1950. Pp. vi, 274. $1.00.)

Eileen, Sister M., O.P., and Katherine Rankin. *A Book of Kindness.* Grade V. (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1950. Pp. xi, 372. $2.00.)

Emory, Frederic. *Queen Anne's County, Maryland.* (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1950. Pp. xii, 629. $7.50.)

Everest, Allan Seymour. *Morgenthau, the New Deal, and Silver: A Story of Pressure Politics.* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1950. Pp. x, 209. $3.50.)

Fifteenth Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States, 1948-1949. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950. Pp. 57.)

Fleming, Walter L. *Documentary History of Reconstruction.* Volumes I and II bound in one. (New York: Peter Smith, 1950. Pp. xviii, 493; xiv, 480. $12.50.) These two books, originally published in 1905 and 1906, represent

an attempt of the present publisher to reprint valuable but practically unobtainable volumes for scholars and research workers. To anyone interested in the reconstruction era they are especially useful. The only drawback is the smallness of the print in such micro-offset books which have four pages of the original on one page of new printing. The pagination of the original is retained, however, and maps and pictures are given special attention.

Fliche, Augustin, Christine Thouzellier and Yvonne Azais. *Histoire de l'eglise.* Volume X. *La Chrétiente romaine (1198-1274).* (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1950. Pp. 512. 960 Fr.)

Foster, Elizabeth Andros (Ed. and Trans.). *Motolinía's History of the Indians of New Spain.* (Berkeley, California: Cortes Society, 1950. Pp. x, 294.) This is number 4 of the new series of Documents and Narratives concerning the discovery and conquest of Latin America.

Gassett, José Ortega y. *The Revolt of the Masses.* (New York: New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1950. Pp. 141. $0.25.)

Gobbell, Luther L. *Church-State Relationships in Education in North Carolina since 1776.* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1938. Pp. xvi, 251. $3.00.)

Golden, Harry L. and Martin Rywell. *Jews in American History. Their Contribution to the United States of America.* (Charlotte: Henry Lewis Martin Co., 1950. Pp. xv, 498. $10.00.)

Gottschalk, Louis. *Lafayette between the American and the French Revolution, 1783-1789.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950. Pp. xi, 461. $7.50.)

Halecki, Oscar. *The Limits and Divisions of European History.* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1950. Pp. xiii, 242. $2.50.)

Halna, J. *Le Bienheureux Dominique Savio élève de Saint Jean Bosco.* (Lyon, France: Emmanuel Vitte, 1950. Pp. 48. 50 Fr.)

Halphen, Louis; Glorieux, P.; Le Bras, Gabriel; Carrière, Victor; Samaran, Charles; Renaudet, Augustin; Dupont-Ferrier, Gustave; Tolédano, André; Pouthas, Charles H. and Calvet, J. *Aspects de l'Université de Paris.* (Paris: Editions Albin Michel, 1949. Pp. 266. 390 Fr.)

Harbison, E. Harris. *Religious Perspectives of College Teaching in History.* (New Haven: Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1950. Pp. 30.) This is a thoughtful essay—one of a series on the religious issues, implications, and responsibilities involved in teaching the various disciplines—on the historian's attitude toward religion. The author presents, as he says, the Protestant viewpoint on the thesis that a man may be "first of all Christian *and* an historian." Actually, Catholics are closer to his way of seeing things than he supposes.

Heschel, Abraham Joshua. *The Earth Is the Lord's.* (New York: Henry Schuman, 1950. Pp. 109. $2.50.)

Hinshaw, David. *Herbert Hoover: American Quaker.* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Co., 1950. Pp. xx, 469. $5.00.)

Jameson, J. Franklin. *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement.* (New York: Peter Smith, 1950. Pp. 100. $2.25.) The historical guild is in the debt of Peter Smith for bringing out reprints of old but highly useful books such as the above which have long been out of print.

Jedin, Hubert. *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient.* Volume I. *Der Kampf um das Konzil.* (Freiburg: Herder and Co., 1949. Pp. xiv, 644. 26.-D.M.)

Keeton, George W. and Georg Schwarzenberger (Eds.). *The Year Book of World Affairs, 1950.* (London: Stevens and Sons, Ltd., for the London Institute of World Affairs, 1950. Pp. viii, 392. 25s. net.)

Kelly, Amy. *Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Four Kings.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950. Pp. xii, 431. $5.00.)

Kennedy, J. H. *Jesuit and Savage in New France.* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950. Pp. 206. $3.75.)

Kennedy, Joseph P. and James M. Landis. *The Surrender of Kind Leopold.* (New York: Ad Press for Joseph P. Kennedy Memorial Foundation, 1950. Pp. 61.)

Labatut, Jean and Wheaton J. Lane (Eds.). *Highways in Our National Life.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. xvi, 506. $7.50.)

Lamont, Corliss. *The Illusion of Immortality.* 2nd Edition. (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Pp. xvii, 316. $3.95.) The book has of course no place in a historical review. The publishers say that this unorthodox treatment of the subject will serve the cause of philosophy. As a matter of fact the volume will probably fall into the hands of defenseless youth who may be hurt by its specious argument. It represents a disservice to America.

Laue, Theodore von. *Leopold Ranke. The Formative Years.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. ix, 230. $4.00.)

Logue, Sister Maria Kostka. *Sisters of St. Joseph of Philadelphia.* (Westminster: Newman Press, 1950. Pp. xii, 380. $5.00.)

Mahn, Jean-Berthold. *Le Pape Benoît XII et les Cisterciens.* (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, Editeur Edouard Champion, 1949. Pp. 152.)

Malin, James C. *Grassland Historical Studies: Natural Resources Utilization in a Background of Science and Technology.* Volume I. *Geology and Geography.* (Lawrence, Kansas: by the author, 1950. Pp. xii, 377. $2.50.)

Marguerite, Sister M., S.N.D., and Mary Beasley. *This Is Our Valley. Advanced Third Reader.* (Boston, Ginn and Co., 1950. Pp. iv, 175. $0.96.)

Mauriac, François. *Proust's Way.* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Pp. 105. $3.00.)

Millikan, Robert A. *The Autobiography of Robert A. Millikan.* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950. Pp. xiv, 311. $4.50.)

Montross, Lynn. *The Reluctant Rebels.* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1950. Pp. viii, 467. $5.00.)

Morgan, Manie Kendley. *The New Stars: Life and Labor in Old Missouri.* (Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1949. Pp. xviii, 301. $3.75.)

Naudé, Gabriel. *Advice on Establishing a Library.* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950. Pp. xiii, 110. $3.00.)

Odegaard, Charles E. *Executive Director's Annual Report for 1949 to the American Council of Learned Societies.* (Washington: American Council of Learned Societies, 1950. Pp. 15.)

Ogg, Frederic A. and P. Roman Ray. *Essentials of American Government.* 6th edition. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1950. Pp. viii, 732. $4.50.) This serviceable text has been re-issued with two new chapters designed to keep students acquainted with the latest revisions of governmental procedure. As one of the basic units in the Century Political Science series, it attempts quite successfully to present the chief features of American national, state, and local government.

Parks, Joseph Howard. *John Bell of Tennessee.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950. Pp. vii, 435. $5.00.)

Pastor, Ludwig von. *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages.* Volume XXXV. *Benedict XIV (1740-1758).* Translated by E. F. Peeler. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950. Pp. xliii, 516. $5.00.)

Patch, Howard Rollin. *The Other World: According to Description in Medieval Literature.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950. Pp. ix, 386. $6.00.)

Petry, Ray C. (Ed.) *No Uncertain Sound: Sermons That Shaped the Pulpit Tradition.* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1948. Pp. xiii, 331. $4.50.)

———, *Preaching in the Great Tradition.* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950. Pp. 122. $2.00.)

Pidal, Ramón Menéndez. *El imperio hispánico y los cinco reinos.* (Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1950. Pp. 227. 20 pts.)

Prescott, H. F. M. *Friar Felix at Large.* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950. Pp. 254. $3.75.)

Reinhardt, Kurt F. *Germany: 2000 Years.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1950. Pp. xxii, 765. $8.50.)

Sabine, George H. *A History of Political Theory.* (Revised Edition.) (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1950. Pp. xxi, 934. $4.50.) The years since Professor Sabine's book first appeared (1937) have seen the further rise of

"left" and "right" Hegelianism in the realm of political action. Since it is Sabine's working hypothesis that political theories are a function of politics, he had to re-write and expand the chapters from Hegel to the end of the book. A more complete bibliography should have been annexed to these last chapters.

St. Mary of Redford, 1843-1949. A Modern Parish with a Pioneer Spirit. By various authors. (Detroit: St. Mary of Redford Parish, 1949. Pp. xiii, 112.)

Santayana, George. *Atoms of Thought.* Assembled and Edited by Ira D. Cardiff. (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Pp. xv, 284. $5.00.)

Schlarman, Joseph H. L. *Mexico: A Land of Volcanoes.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1950. Pp. xiv, 640. $5.00.)

Schenk, W. *Reginald Pole: Cardinal of England.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc., 1950. Pp. xvi, 176. $3.00.)

Schilling, Bernard N. *Conservative England and the Case against Voltaire.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950. Pp. xii, 394. $4.50.)

Schoenrich, Otto. *The Legacy of Christopher Columbus.* 2 volumes. (Glendale, California: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1950. Pp. 349; 320. $25.00 set.)

Schultz, Harold S. *Nationalism and Sectionalism in South Carolina 1852-1860.* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1950. Pp. x, 259. $4.50.)

Selective Checklist of Prints and Photographs, recently catalogued and made available for reference, *Lots 2985-3442.* (Washington: Library of Congress, 1950. Pp. 55.)

Sevrin, Ernest. *Un conflit ecclésiastique sous la Restauration. Mgr. De Latil, Evêque de Chartres, 1821-1824 et M. Chasles, Curé de la Cathédrale.* (Chartres: 1950. Pp. viii, 261.)

Sheehan, Donald. *The Making of American History.* Volume I. *The Emergence of a Nation.* Volume II. *Democracy in an Industrial World.* (New York: Dryden Press, 1950. Pp. viii, 700, viii. $2.40 each.)

Sixty-Sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1948-1949. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950. Pp. 34.)

Smit, Dr. M. C. *De verhouding van Christendom en Historie in de huidige Rooms-Katholieke geschiedbeschouwing.* (Kampen, Netherlands: J. K. Kok, 1950. Pp. 220. 4.90 d.f.)

Stephen, Leslie. *The English Utilitarians.* Volumes I, II, III, bound in one. (New York: Peter Smith, 1950. Pp. viii, 326; vi, 382; vi, 525. $15.00.) A micro-offset book. These books are published in editions of only 100 to 250 copies. The work originally appeared in 1900 and has long been hard to get. Libraries and specialists will be grateful for this reprint.

Swain, Joseph Ward. *The Ancient World.* Volume I. *Empires and City-States of the Ancient Orient and Greece before 334 B.C.* Volume II. *The World Empires: Alexander and the Romans after 334 B.C.* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1950. Pp. xx, 578; xiv, 658. $4.00 each.) The presentation of the history of Christ, with evidence suppressed and a one-sided bibliography, will make it impossible for any school under Christian auspices to use this textbook. A large number of students in any American college will resent the author's callous indifference to the values of revealed religion. Though an advertisement asserts that "No other text in the field gives as full consideration to the ancient religions, especially Judaism and Christianity," the treatment is in fact completely subversive. The publishers have lavished great expense on these volumes. Their textbooks in the past have served the cause of history well. It is unfortunate that this work departs from their fine traditions.

Swann, Nancy Lee. (Tr.) *Food and Money in Ancient China—Han Shu 24.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. xiii, 480. $10.00.)
xiii, 480. $10.00.)

Turner, Frederick Jackson. *The Significance of Sections in American History.* With an introduction by Max Farrand. (New York: Peter Smith, 1950. Pp. ix, 347. $4.25.) All students of American history will be glad to have a reprint of the Turner essays on sectionalism.